India

FOR THE

No. 16. New Series.
No. 110. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 1898.

Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 241
A Famine *Pour Rire!*... 244
In the Path of Famine 244
Pills for Earthquakes, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P. 245
Is Resolution XXV of 1827 Legal? by E. H. Pickersgill, M.P. 246
The Prophet of the "Forwards" ... 247
The Week in Parliament 249
Chronicle of the Week 249
Mr. A. M. Bose at Manchester ... 250
The *Pioneer* on Lord Roberts 252
India in Parliament 253
Advertisements 255-256

NOTES AND NEWS.

WE reproduce elsewhere a notable article from the *Pioneer* upon Lord Roberts's recent essay, or manifesto, on the "forward" frontier policy. It is pleasant to see a journal of the ability and influence of the *Pioneer* "finding salvation"—or, at any rate, tending in that direction—upon a matter which lies so near to the best interests of India. But if Allahabad has repented, Bombay has not. The *Bombay Gazette* has sometimes, no doubt, deviated into sense. But the *Times of India* remains incorrigible. If it avoids the worst excesses of the "forward" school—such excesses, for example, as the state of mind which permitted the *Morning Post* the other day gravely to discuss the prospects of a Muscovite descent upon Chitral by water-carriage—still it shows clearly enough how lively and aggressive the "forward" policy is. In its issue of March 26, the *Times of India* said:—

> A passage in Lord George Hamilton's recent speech in the debate on frontier policy seems open to considerable misapprehension. The Secretary of State urged that there should be "an exact and authoritative definition of our limits of frontier activity." It may be pointed out, however, that unless everything up to the Durand line is to be held as British territory, such a definition would be a distinct revocation of the first principle he enunciated, that of conferring a practically free hand on the Governor-General in Council. It would not be difficult to show that an exact definition of the limits of our frontier activity is, however desirable, practically impossible of attainment. The operations now being conducted from the coast of the Persian Gulf are a sufficient proof that departures from such a policy must occasionally be inevitable. Similar cases may easily arise at many points, for it should not be forgotten that the real frontier of the Indian Empire is not the scene of the recent conflicts with the Afridi and Waziri tribes, but that it stretches virtually from the mouth of the Shat-el-Arab at the head of the Persian Gulf, along the southern borders of Afghanistan and Thibet, to Burmah and Yunnan.

This harum-scarum description of "the real frontier of the Indian Empire" is by no means new, as India knows to her cost. Quasi-official writers have for some years been sowing tares of this kind in influential sections of the Press, while Liberal leaders and other public men have slumbered and slept, and the mischief-makers have seen their hare-brained schemes carried out—to the foot of the Pamirs, to Kafiristan, and in the "punitive" campaign in Tirah. But is it not high time that the pernicious theory that "our limits of frontier [*i.e.*, trans-frontier] activity" cannot be exactly defined was abandoned? How about the Statute of 1858? By what extra legal devices has the frontier been extended since that time? And what is the doctrine of a "free hand" for the Viceroy? This matter—like the no less important questions suggested by the present policy of internal repression in India—is eminently worthy of the attention of the Front Opposition Bench, and the first step in the direction of sanity is, it seems to us, to remove the conditions which make for habitual secrecy in the proceedings of the India Council.

We recently drew attention to the criticisms passed by the *Madras Mail* upon the administration of the retiring Commander-in-Chief, Sir George White. It is not a little startling to find that the *Pioneer* itself substantially bears out some of our Madras contemporary's criticisms. Thus:

> General White was handicapped, perhaps because he was in some measure prejudiced by his exclusive service in a British regiment. He had not had that touch with the Native Army which had made his predecessor in office so strong to command the enthusiastic devotion of the sepoy; his acquaintance with many problems of India army administration was limited; and he had much to learn regarding the working of the military machinery. There was an apparent want of sympathy with officers and men. Lord Roberts indeed was in such close and active sympathy with the wants and wishes of the army as a whole, that occasional instances of the exercise of personal patronage which would ordinarily raise a storm were good-humouredly forgiven. The new régime at Army Headquarters was felt to be more rigid and exclusive than during the preceding seven years. The Commander-in-Chief was no longer easily accessible, and an impression gained ground that outside one narrow circle that intimate personal acquaintance with officers and their regiments, especially of the Native Army, upon which previous Commanders-in-Chief had prided themselves was no longer desired.

The handicapping theory is but a poor apology; and the *Madras Mail* probably sums up the matter with rough justice when it says that "as a regimental officer Sir George White was an unqualified success," but "as Commander-in-Chief he was an unqualified failure."

In some criticisms on Indian education, contained in his last volume, Mark Twain repeats the charge which he had already made with respect to American education in the preface to "English as She is Taught." "Things," he complains, are taught instead of "meanings." The antithesis, as it is expressed, is not a very forcible one; but the general drift of the charge is clear—that the child's memory is burdened with knowledge that conveys no living ideas to him. The accusation, as in the American case, is apparently based on a collection of so-called humorous answers. Now it is quite true that such an answer as "Cardinal Wolsey died in disentry in a church on his way to be blockheaded" has its pathetic as well as its humorous side. It may merely mean that the writer was wilfully careless—no teaching will eliminate such cases; but it may also mean (and that is the pathetic possibility) that the child was being taught what he was not capable of assimilating. But Mark Twain and some other impatient critics of our educational system fail to see that such an answer only condemns the system if it is common enough to be regarded as typical. They have no notion of the difficulty, or rather the impossibility, of so graduating classes that every child shall, in every point, be taught exactly what he is capable of learning with profit. That, of course, is the ideal—an ideal none the less necessary for the teacher to keep in view because it is unattainable. But criticism of educational methods, if it is to be helpful, should realise the difficulties of the problem more than it is apt to do.

The other point urged by Mark Twain is the familiar one: that the educated Hindu boy despises manual labour and cares only for "a black coat" and office-work. The same cry is raised in many European countries and in America. The fault does not lie altogether with our educational methods; the whole social system must share the blame. But parents and teachers and educational authorities might do a great deal to lessen the evil if they would oftener speak to the young in the strain of the admirable address delivered by the Vice-Chancellor of the Allahabad University at its annual Convocation. After pointing out that at the rate at which graduates are being multiplied, it is impossible that all should find service under Government or in the learned professions, Mr. Justice Aikman called the attention of his hearers to the applications of science to manufactures and agriculture as affording a career to educated young men; and, further, begged any who should fail to obtain the rewards in life which they thought they deserved not to let themselves be embittered. A long succession of prizes at school and college is only too apt to produce an expectancy that the prizes will be continued throughout life, and a vague feeling that it is the duty of somebody to continue to bestow them. Much pain might be saved if clever boys were taught that the giving of rewards implies a condition

of tutelage; and that it is the privilege of manhood to be independent and self-reliant and to gain or make prizes for itself. The man who is truly educated has in that very education something which should console, instead of embittering, him if he fails to secure external emolument.

Mr. Horace Bell, M.Inst.C.E., read an interesting and instructive paper yesterday (Thursday) before the Indian Section of the Society of Arts. His subject was "Recent Railway Policy in India." The chief interest of the paper lay in its guarded but none the less searching criticism of this policy. Mr. Bell has spent the best years of his life in the construction and administration of Indian railways. He is, therefore, no hostile witness regarding the Government of India's railway enterprise. All the more, therefore, is his well-balanced fault-finding entitled to consideration. After briefly reviewing the history of Indian railway policy, and showing how frequently and how widely it changed in scope and purpose from time to time, though fundamentally affected for good by the "stringent and salutary control" by the State which was initiated by Lord Dalhousie and has continued as a salient feature of Indian railway enterprise ever since, Mr. Bell proceeded to make some much-needed comments on recent development. He pointed out that in the last 50 years there have been opened for traffic in India 21,000 miles of railway, representing roughly about one mile of line for every 15,000 people. Japan, however, will in 25 years have carried out a railway system representing one mile for every 7,000 people; "that is, they have done four times better than we have in India." "What is most striking in the story," he continued, "are the important changes which have characterised railway policy in India, and the frequent vacillations in recent years." Deprecating unqualified censure of the Government's policy—how should an old servant do otherwise?—he suggested pretty plainly that the policy in force of recent years has not been one which was "best adapted to meet the needs of the country." This is just what Indian reformers—miscalled enemies of British rule—have been urging upon a stubborn official hierarchy these many years.

In Mr. Bell's opinion "the canker at the bottom of the whole policy of the Government of recent years" has been the large share which the State still has in the direct working and detailed administration of railways. His belief is that the only way to introduce new life into Indian railways is to get a free and unrestricted flow of private capital into India, and that this implies the gradual, but eventually complete, abandonment of State administration. Mr. Bell fights curiously shy of the financial aspect of this State policy, with its enormous increase of gold liabilities. But, though his reasons may not be the best available, his conclusions at any rate are in the right direction. Private enterprise, private capital, wisely expended on commercial principles, and *not* the large expenditure in sterling of an extravagant Government—too often influenced by political considerations—constitute, in the opinion of many competent judges, the true method of developing Indian railways. On the plea so often put forward by officials that there is no enterprise in "private enterprise," and that therefore the State must take the risk, Mr. Bell quotes a telling fact within his knowledge. Last year, it seems, a fine offer was made to Government to supply capital for constructing some 350 miles of railway in the Punjab without any guarantee whatever. The ordinary man would think that the Government of India in its distressed financial condition would have jumped at such an offer. Not a bit of it. The reply was that certain of the lines were not wanted, and others would be made by Government. With regard to the lines said to be not wanted, it is enough to explain that the meaning of the phrase "not wanted" is "not wanted by the Government." Lines made by Government are termed "feeders," while those originated by private enterprise are too often characterised as "bleeders" in relation to existing systems—the fear being that though they may open up new ground, they may reduce the direct profits of the State. "Comment is needless."

The following portion of the recent speech of the Governor of Bombay deserves attention:—

> It has been ascertained that the house-to-house search has not produced the effects and the results that it was hoped would accrue from it from former experience, and therefore to replace general searching I am prepared to substitute as an experiment an undertaking from the various communities through their leaders that they will enable the headmen of the various communities to give notice of suspicious cases of illness, for I believe that by this means, with your hearty co-operation, we shall obtain as accurate information of plague cases as heretofore; indeed, I hope greater accuracy. It has been decided to confine the evacuation of houses, and their disinfection, to those houses where a case of plague is discovered or a death has occurred which is not known to be due to a cause other than plague. (Applause.) You are aware that the British soldiers have been withdrawn from searching operations since March 5.

The discontinuance of house-to-house search and of the employment of British soldiers is precisely what the Native Indian Press has been begging for during the last twelve months. It would be calamitous indeed to teach the people of India that their requests will not be heeded unless and until they are followed by actual disturbance.

Lord Sandhurst is also reported to have said:

> I am especially anxious that all grievances and all complaints should be thoroughly ventilated and explained, for very often a complaint is exaggerated owing to there being misunderstanding. I therefore propose that at the office of the Commissioner of Police a certain number of gentlemen from amongst the Mahometans, the Hindus, and the Parsees shall form what we call in England a "roster," and one of each of these communities, together with a Government officer, shall attend at this office from 3 to 5 o'clock every day for the purpose of hearing and ventilating these complaints. The idea is a very simple one, and it cannot but relieve the Plague Committee. It is, at any rate, an attempt to clear the air, and in the proceedings of that committee and in its results I shall take the very greatest interest.

This is an excellent arrangement. If it had been adopted when nearly two thousand petitioners in Poona laid their grievances before the Governor last year, a great deal of irritation and unpleasantness—and foolish legislation—might have been avoided. What is really wanted is more sympathy with the people and a more active desire to remove their grievances—in all Indian administrators, from the Secretary of State to the Legal Member who goes out to India to legislate for the people.

When the *Daily Chronicle* and other English papers published our telegram about the great public meeting held in Calcutta to protest against the Sedition Bill, the *Times* hastened to publish a counter telegram suggesting that the leaders of the Calcutta Bar had not taken an active part in the proceedings of the meeting. Here is what Mr. Pugh—one of the foremost men at the Calcutta Bar—said the other day at the annual meeting of the European and Anglo-Indian Defence Association:

> As regards the Sedition Bill, I am bound to say that for my part I look upon it as a Bill which, according to the statement of the members of the Council, was not required here, and from what they have told us I cannot help coming to the conclusion that this Bill was sent out to them from England to pass here. This is a state of things which ought not to exist, because if the law was sufficient as it stood before, why create this ferment in the country in order to get what has been described as a declaratory Bill to make more clear what was sufficiently clear before?

Some further remarks which Mr. Pugh made about the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill also deserve attention:—

> Where you put more power in the hands of magistrates and diminish the power of revision by the High Court, as is done in this Bill, it is a thing we ought to protest against in the interests of the Anglo-Indian community and the country at large in which their interests are, to my mind, inseparably bound up.

The Calcutta *Englishman* has some sensible remarks upon Mr. Stead's scheme to expose in England the abuses of Indian administration:

> We still think it a pity, from the Government's own standpoint, that the sedition legislation of recent enactment was rushed through the Council with such unseemly haste. The Government was bound to leave some items out of the reckoning, and now it transpires that it has omitted the most important of them all. The grip of authority may be retained upon the throat of the Indian Press until its eyes start from its head, but there is such an institution as an English Press, and there is such an individual as Mr. Stead. . . . . The net result of the business, so far as Government is concerned, will be that criticism which it is not thought safe to publish in India will be franked on to London, where it will be read by a wider and more influential constituency, although perhaps one less acquainted with the facts, than it would otherwise have reached. The Government could not have chosen a worse time than the present to threaten the liberty of the Press, considering its numerous embarrassments, and the attention which they are exciting at home.

The Indian Government, which is strong enough to retain its grip "upon the throat of the Indian Press until its eyes start from its head," knows better than to raise its finger against an English journal like the *Review of Reviews*.

Mr. A. M. Bose has done well to draw public attention (in his admirable speech at Manchester, which is reported on another page) to the retrograde and disastrous Bill which aims a death-blow at municipal self-government in the metropolis of India. But it would seem that in the following passage he has not been quite correctly reported :—

Hitherto the people had had the right of electing two-thirds of the members, the Government selecting one-third and appointing the chairman. Now it was proposed that the Government should choose two-thirds, leaving the people to elect the remainder.

As we understand the Bill, it leaves unaltered the rules about the election of the Municipal Commissioners. What it proposes to do is virtually to transfer the executive power from the Commissioners to a body of twelve men, and of these twelve men only four are to be elected by the Municipal Commissioners. Practically the people are being deprived of control over municipal administration, but the thing is being done, as usual, with ingenuity and not openly. It is no better for that.

Mr. Nalin Bihari Sircar, a ward commissioner of Calcutta, has published a sharp criticism of Sir Alexander Mackenzie's speech in the Bengal Legislative Council on the proposed change in the Municipal Law; and he proposes to return to the attack upon the measure in fuller detail. He denies absolutely the alleged "complete breakdown" of the conservancy, and states that, on the contrary, the commissioners remedied previous laxness and "took prompt measures for the special and more thorough cleansing of the town rendered necessary by the apprehended advent of the plague." He also explicitly challenges the allegation that there was "serious confusion in many other departments of the Municipal administration without the possibility of determining with any approach to certainty where the responsibility for such a state of things lies"; and he cites official reports and facts in contradiction of the assertion that "the present constitution of the municipality is ill-adapted to stand the strain of a sudden emergency." It is certainly difficult, in the face of the Municipal Act, to understand what Sir Alexander Mackenzie means by saying that "in point of fact, under the present law, there is no municipal constitution at all in the proper sense of the word—everything is fluid and indefinite." There must evidently be something behind this, and the proposed remedy confirms the suspicion. Mr. Sircar shows that the new proposal is simply a resuscitation of a proposal made some 23 years ago, and rejected as unsuitable even then. It would "virtually reduce the Municipality into the position of the Port Trust, into a 'close borough' system, with the European commercial community greatly predominating in it." It would reduce Calcutta below Bombay. One would like to know what was the nature of the representation on which, as it is said, the approval of the Government of India and the Secretary of State was secured for this grotesquely reactionary scheme.

The *Hindu* continues its useful series of articles on the Land Revenue Settlements which have brought Madras cultivators to poverty and indebtedness. Referring to Sir Henry Fowler's recent statement in the House of Commons that no increase of rental is demanded for improvements made by the tenant himself, the *Hindu* says :—

The theory is that improvements made at private expense are exempted from increase by the Settlement officers; but in practice, as everybody knows, no such exemption is granted by these officers. The increase is made not directly or ostensibly on improvements, but is done under the well-known pretence of the re-classification of the soil. Every time that the assessment is revised in a district, the soil is re-classified according to quality, and it often happens that improvement in the quality of the soil has been effected by the rayat's own labour or enterprise. Still, the improved soil is assessed at higher rates, let the rayats protest and remonstrate ever so loudly. A Committee of experts appointed by Lord Connemara in 1888 reported: "We consider, therefore, that Government should distinctly declare by legislation that, in any revision of assessment that may be made after the first, soils will not be re-valued. In this way, the value of his improvements will be absolutely secured to the rayat, for they will afford no basis for the enhancement of the Government demand upon him, and the stability of his tenure will be assured." This recommendation was not adopted.

In the Madras Presidency the net increase of revenue in the settled districts amounted in the year 1896-97 to more than 84 lakhs of rupees. In the Central Provinces the land revenue demanded has increased since 1885 to nearly 23 lakhs of rupees. We commend the following extract from the *Hindu* to the notice of the authorities :—

Sir Henry Fowler might profitably read the most instructive report of the Deccan Riots Commission and the speeches in the Council when legislation was undertaken on the recommendations of that Commission. He will see from that report that the very officials whom he so much admires admitted that the land revenue system was mainly answerable for the ruin of the rayats, and that if they were deeply involved in debts it was not because they were given to certain extravagant habits—which the Commission proved were not extravagant at all—but because of the harsh and rigid enforcement of the Government's demand, which was in most cases too high to be met from ordinary resources. It is Sir Henry Fowler's fiction that the land revenue system is not oppressive; but what is the truth? On the occasion we have referred to above, Sir Theodore Hope—a Bombay civilian—admitted in his opening speech that "to our revenue system must in candour be ascribed some share in the indebtedness of the rayat."

Mr. Luttman-Johnson's able address on the recent earthquake in Assam has been published in the *Journal of the Society of Arts* (April 15). Assam, though inferior as an earthquake country to Japan, yet produces one considerable shock per annum. The recent earthquake, however, has broken all local records in point of destructiveness and general contortion of the solid earth; and Mr. Luttman-Johnson's examples, drawn from various quarters of the affected country, indicate its fearsome character. In all the disorganisation of the time it is to be noted with extreme satisfaction that the behaviour of the Native servants was most exemplary and unselfish. The Native population generally behaved exceedingly well. Mr. Luttman-Johnson mentions some curious beliefs of the Garos of the hills. One story current among them is that the Queen, "not content with the last earthquake, has ordered another and more vigorous one, to be followed by a cyclone" The tea gardens lie mainly outside the area of greatest disturbance, and only in a few places was manufacture interrupted. The shock passed, in varying degrees of intensity, throughout the neighbouring province of Bengal, and Sir William Bisset declared that he felt it at Simla. Even in Bengal "the bed of one river has risen about ten to fifteen feet for a distance of some twenty miles, and, as a consequence, the drainage has passed over the country, flooding a number of villages." There is no experience in England to enable people to realise the effects of such an upheaval. Yet the smaller quakings following in the train of the great shock were not over before cricket and polo were again in full swing upon the scene.

It would do some of our fire-eaters good to read the lecture on "Indian Loyalty," recently delivered by Professor M. Rangacharya, of the Kumbhakonam College, before the Madras University Union, and now reprinted from the *Weekly Review* (Minerva Press: Thompson and Co.). The lecture is based on a broad survey of history, bringing out race characteristics and their manifestation in events. The Hindus are traditionally tolerant and peace-loving—so much so that forceful Britishers have a way of speaking of the "mild Babu." The Mahometans are a martial race. Yet Professor Rangacharya declares that "there is no gainsaying this great fact of history, that Mahometanism has, on the whole, shown a much greater amount of sweet reasonableness in India than anywhere else, and that Indian Mussulmans are as loyal subjects of the State to-day as" the Hindus. He justly points out how much the Indians themselves had to do with accomplishing the British conquest, as well as how much they have done by their valour to maintain it. "So then," he says, "Indian interests and British interests are as permanently and as indissolubly united as the blood of the sepoy and the soldier have been mingled together on the same side in all the battlefields known to British-Indian history"—even during the Mutiny. "Can anything be stronger and more durable than this bond of blood?" "We are loyal," he concludes, "by our historical traditions and our natural temperaments: loyalty is, as it were, in our very constitution." Suspicions of disloyalty arise mainly from a deplorable lack of understanding and of sympathy; and, if there is any real cause for a tendency to disloyalty anywhere, it is to be sought in the unhappy attitude of some of the civilian officers, for "suffering is sometimes almost recklessly caused to us by more than one ignorant and unworthy British fellow-subject of ours in Great Britain and the Greater Britain, often unwittingly, of course, but still not the less lamentably for it."

A FAMINE *POUR RIRE!*

NUMBER VI of "Further Papers regarding the Famine and the relief operations in India during the years 1896-97" has just been issued as a Parliamentary Blue-book. "The Account"—by T. W. Holderness, I.C.S., Deputy Secretary (Famine) to the Government of India—"given in these pages of the Famine of 1896-97 has no claim to be more than an imperfect sketch put together from incomplete and scattered materials." It is well that no such claim is put forward, for the "narrative" is singularly incomplete in one all-important particular—famine mortality. With its merits or demerits in other respects we confess to little concern. Sir Antony MacDonnell, writing with unrivalled authority in his report of the Famine in the North-West Provinces, which we noticed last week, has laid it down as an axiom that "the death-rate is the best test of the sufficiency or insufficiency of a relief organisation." Naturally, therefore, in a narrative of a famine, we look for the fullest information on this point, for how else shall we judge of the Government's readiness to grapple with the calamity, or of their success in the long struggle to mitigate its worst effects? The deficiency of rainfall, the character of the climate, the extent of irrigation, the utility of railway communication, the price of grain, the course of trade, the movements of food stuffs, the effects on revenue—all these matters become interesting when there is scarcity. But their nice elucidation and elaborate dissection do not constitute a sufficient record of what is meant by famine. Famine in itself is a small thing compared with what it implies. There may be famine and yet but little distress. The whole gravity of famine consists in its effects. The whole gravity of its effects begins and ends in its effect upon the health of the people—and that is best summed up in the death-rate. For every death implies a greater amount of disease and suffering, and where the death-rate is high, there, it may be safely assumed, disease and suffering are widely prevalent.

How, then, does this narrative approach the question of the famine mortality? Let us quote Mr. Holderness at some length, to show that we do him no injustice. This is the more necessary because we say deliberately that Mr. Holderness starts with the determination to rule out the phrase "death from starvation." It is by this time common knowledge that the order went forth that there was to be no famine in the Central Provinces, and that the order had a disastrous effect upon the preparedness and organisation of the Local Government. It is also common knowledge that the supreme Government of India, as indicated by Lord George Hamilton's conduct at the inception of the Mansion House Relief Fund, set its face like a flint against the idea of any famine anywhere until neglected facts rose up and overwhelmed it. That was the beginning of the policy of concealment. Here now we have the final flourish at the end of the Government's signature attesting the results of that monstrous policy. At first the cry was "No famine;" now it is "No death from starvation." Newspaper correspondents may write of the appalling things they saw, death-rates may be terrible and clamorous, but still that impalpable entity, the Government of India, which decided *contra naturam* that there would be no famine, stolidly writes by the hand of its faithful servant that, if there was famine, at least there was no famine mortality. Here is what Mr. Holderness writes:—

> An attempt has been made in the recent famine to have all deaths directly due to starvation, and also—in some provinces—indirectly due to the effects of privation, separately returned. The results in a way are satisfactory, as, with the one exception of the Central Provinces, no province in India has returned in any month more than one or two, at most, verified deaths from starvation. Usually the return has been blank.

We can well believe it.* But did a responsible Government ever trifle more conspicuously with truth in the face of the public? Can official quibbling go further, or can official disingenuousness hope for a more signal exercise of its faculty? How have these blank returns been obtained? By a very simple process. Anyone who obviously had died of starvation was generally called an unknown wanderer. If this allegation failed, the plea was set up that it was impossible to certify the actual and immediate cause of death; and so on. Let us quote again:

> Deaths in which privation or starvation has been suspected, have virtually been confined to stray cases of unknown wanderers found dead in the open country, and of persons dying after admission to a poor-house. In such cases, verification of the cause of death has not been found possible, and they have properly been excluded from the return.

"Properly excluded from the return"! Of course—all the deaths from starvation were excluded from the return—and then the column headed "deaths from starvation" (or was it "privation"?) was returned blank. The thing is hardly credible, but there it is. Because a human being dies from starvation "after admission to a poor-house," is that any the less a death from starvation? What happened in the Central Provinces? There the mortality was too frightful for such crude methods of concealment to be employed. So another method is adopted. The correctness of the returns is impugned. The Government is therefore in this position. Where the deaths from starvation are a manageable quantity in a district—that is to say, where they can safely be absorbed in the general death-rate—the returns will be made blank. Where these deaths are too numerous to make this simple procedure either safe or convincing, the correctness of the figures is denied.

"In the Central Provinces this rule of exclusion was not adopted [*i.e.*, in the Central Provinces deaths from starvation were returned as such], and the reporting agency, which consists of village watchmen and subordinate police officers, was permitted or directed to return as deaths due to starvation or privation all cases in which starvation or privation might be conjectured from circumstances more or less general."

"Might be conjectured!" Really, one can have no patience with this mode of dealing with fact. When men and women, after being for months in these Central Provinces poor-houses, were found to be starving by English eye-witnesses—when the narrative of these witnesses to fact reveals a perfectly appalling state of things in these Provinces—is the British public to be put off with the suggestion that these deaths from starvation are merely the "conjecture" of village watchmen? We say unhesitatingly that this chapter on the mortality of the famine in the "narrative" we are reviewing is a disgraceful document. There are not wanting other suggestions of cause. Cholera, malaria, fever—anything but starvation. Yet here are the figures for the month of August, 1897, in the Central Provinces:

Death-rate per mille (cholera excluded).

	August.	*Annual rate.*
Saugor	11·5	127·0
Leoni	12·1	145·2
Neaudla	16·1	193·2
Narsinghpur	7·1	85·2
Betul	11·5	127·0
Raipur	9·5	114·0
Bilaspur	12·4	148·8

Upon this awful state of things we have the simply fatuous comment that the "continuous rise in the death-rate of so many districts after the disturbing element of cholera mortality has been eliminated, is one of the most perplexing questions which have arisen in connexion with the famine in the Central Provinces." On the contrary, it is the least perplexing thing in the whole calamitous situation. It is the very natural consequence of the gross mismanagement which characterised the Government's conduct of famine operations in the Central Provinces and elsewhere wherever the supreme Government, from whatever cause, contrived to interfere in the direction of affairs.

Here, then, is the salient point in this narrative of the famine. NO DEATHS FROM STARVATION, according to the veracious chronicles of the Government of India. AN APPALLING FAMINE MORTALITY, according to that sternest and most intractable of all witnesses—Death. The public may believe which recorder they will. The authorities would persuade us that there has merely been a famine *pour rire.*

IN THE PATH OF FAMINE.[1]

THERE is too much of ordinary Anglo-Indian prejudice about Mr. Merewether. It was not possible for him, however highly gifted he may be as a newspaper correspondent, to write a really good book about the famine. It is almost a pity that he did not rest content with the telegrams he sent at the time. Still his book has this

[1] "A Tour through the Famine Districts of India." By F. H. S. Merewether, Reuter's Special Famine Commissioner. (A. D. Innes and Co., 1898.)

use. It reveals from the point of view of one whose belief in Indian officials and Anglo-Indian ways is beyond suspicion the terrible failure of the machinery of Government in the Central Provinces during the famine. It shows, moreover, how that failure was largely due to the absurd optimism of the Central or Supreme Government acting upon local authorities, mostly inexperienced and in some cases unintelligent. Let us follow Mr. Merewether through the chief cities of the Central Provinces and see how the state of things struck this hard-headed, glib, and not too sympathetic Englishman, who was hand and glove with every official he met on his tour, and who had and made use of unrivalled opportunities for seeing the truth.

Nagpur. At Nagpur Mr. Merewether visited the poor-house, and interviewed the Deputy Commissioner. Of the latter he says:—

> The impression left upon my mind after my interview was that the famine was not considered to be a very serious one in this district, and that the authorities thought themselves fully capable of coping with any pressure that might occur.

After visiting the poor-house, which, of its kind, was in his opinion the best he saw during his tour, our author writes as follows:—

> Fresh from my visit to the poor-house and with the sights I had seen there indelibly impressed upon my mind, I must confess that I conceived the idea that the officials had not sufficiently grasped the real importance of the situation. *Ex uno disie omnes*, and I must say that in my whole tour through the Central Provinces the more I saw of the crisis the more was this opinion confirmed. From high quarters the *hookum* (order) had gone forth, there was to be no famine in Central India, and the subordinates of Government were trying to carry out this order. At a dinner that night I met one or two officers of the State, and the general tone of the conversation showed me that had it been advisable these men, who had every opportunity of arriving at the true state of affairs, could present a very different picture. One man mentioned incidentally that in a small *shikar* expedition he had come across the body of a woman, the corpse still warm; and yet this woman had died of inanition almost within grasp of help. This was not a solitary instance, each man there being able to recount similar recent experiences.

Raipur. At Raipur Mr. Merewether was the guest of the Chairman of the Municipality, and with him visited the poor-house. In spite of unremitting attention, he found the patients "in a very poor way."

> We discussed the question, and came to the conclusion that the allowance of food as per State regulations was not all-sufficing, and ought to be increased. The daily dole, though sufficient to keep life in the recipient, was not enough to build up his strength. The Chairman had memorialised Government on this point, but had not received an official reply.

Unfortunately nature takes small account of the niceties of official red-tape. In the meantime, it is a relief to know that this insufficient daily dole was being supplemented with funds drawn from private charity. But the blame and the shame of such a state of things belong to Government. At this same place—Raipur—Mr. Merewether himself saw two men who had been in the poor-house for over two months, "and yet they were merely the effigies of men"; adding, "I could have multiplied instances of this by the score."

Bilaspur. Of the poor-house at this place Mr. Merewether says: "I was in a way prepared for horrors, but what I did find on arrival at the poor-house far exceeded anything I had possibly imagined." And again, he writes: "I have been into and through some dozen or two of poor-houses, but Bilaspur stands out by itself as a pattern of monumental mismanagement."

> Inside the walls, if we can call the thorn-fence such, the sights were of the most horrible and pitiable description, and I say advisedly and with due reason, from personal observation, that the inmates of this supposedly charitable institution were being condemned to a horrible and lingering death. Many of them told me that they had been there for months, and could not get enough to eat. In fact, the universal wail was, "Bhukha, bhukha, Sahib" (hungry, hungry, Sahib).

Then, after giving some harrowing instances of what was happening and with what results to the inmates in this "supposedly charitable institution," Mr. Merewether says briefly: "This was starvation pure and simple." But then what can one expect when it is on record, according to the testimony of our author, that notwithstanding the very apparent and appalling famine which prevailed, the Government of India had chosen this time for demanding from the civil authorities of Bilaspur a careful report showing the effect that the distress was having or likely to have upon the cloth industry of the district! Result—while the clerical staff were laboriously preparing elaborate and careful statistics upon this engrossing topic, the actual inhabitants of Bilaspur were dying of starvation.

> I mentioned previously that my opinion was that the famine in the Central Provinces was grossly mismanaged. I collected tangible proofs of this daily, till I had to hand a mass of reliable and irrefutable evidence which showed only too clearly that the officials and those responsible had not and did not fully recognise the gravity of the situation.

Here, then, is a brief epitome of the famine in the Central Provinces.

The supreme Government, ill-informed and optimistic, displaying an ill-timed curiosity in the course of local trade.

The local authorities tamely reporting no famine in response to orders from head-quarters.

The poor-houses, institutions for keeping starving people in a state of prolonged starvation—"Abandon hope all ye who enter here," their appropriate motto.

The people dying, and "gross mismanagement" by the Government.

In the North-West Provinces Mr. Merewether found a very different state of things.

> I may say, in conclusion, that the North-West Provinces accomplished much; and it is owing to the promptitude with which their repressive measures were adopted and carried out, that, though the pressure was perhaps even severer there than in the Central Provinces, the butcher's bill was not a tenth of that in Central India.

Altogether, Mr. Merewether's book brings out with great clearness how much Government may do to mitigate or aggravate the effects of a famine upon the people—and shows how the chaos prevailing in the Central Provinces was the fault of Government, as the successful fight waged with want in the North-West Provinces was the result of the energy and foresight of the local Government. From a literary point of view the book is probably no better and no worse than the telegrams the author sent home when he was on tour. But then the standard of newspaper telegrams is not exacting. The Story of the Great Famine of 1896-7 has yet to be written.

PILLS FOR EARTHQUAKES.

By Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart, M.P.

SIR JOHN WOODBURN, speaking in the Viceroy's Council, announces that legislation is being undertaken to relieve the indebtedness of the Indian agricultural community. This is much needed. But how does the Government of India propose to go about it? The only right and reasonable way is by a detailed and searching village enquiry, in order to ascertain the true causes which have led to this indebtedness. The rural villages include eighty per cent. of the population, and the village community is the microcosm of all India, so that if the means can be discovered to relieve one village from debt and make it prosperous, a clue will be obtained to make all rural India prosperous. The rayat is a small and humble person. He does not want any heroic action, but patient and detailed enquiry into his grievances, and remedies suited to his condition.

Twenty years ago an enquiry of this kind was instituted, in order to ascertain the causes which led to the agrarian disturbances in the Deccan. This enquiry was conducted by the Deccan Riots Commission in a most business-like way, from village to village, the exact financial position of each rayat being ascertained, with the history and causes of his ruin. And I have no hesitation in saying that the five volumes of the Commissioners' report contain the most trustworthy record in existence regarding the rayat's economic condition. One of the most important conclusions arrived at by the Commissioners was that the rayat was driven to the money-lender by the harsh and rigid enforcement of the Government revenue demand. That was in fact the origin of the rayat's woes. Once in the hands of the money-lender, and subjected to the process of the debt courts, his ruin was soon completed.

Now has Sir John Woodburn profited by these experiences? Does he contemplate a real diagnosis of the peasant's ailment, and does he propose to attack the causes of the evil, or only its external symptom? I regret to say that in his speech introducing a Bill to amend the Contract Act he shows no signs of an intention to make a scientific diagnosis, or to go to the root of the matter in any way. He refers indeed to the legislation of 1879, but fails to accept the lesson which it teaches. On the contrary he

makes a scapegoat of the money-lender, and touches only the merest surface of the question, when he proposes to give "greater protection to the ignorant peasantry of the country in monetary dealings with the more astute money-lender." As a matter of fact the rayat is by no means so ignorant or simple as is often assumed. He goes to the money-lender because he sees no other refuge. He is rack-rented by the Government, which exacts its dues punctually in cash without reasonable consideration for his position, and sells up his land rigorously if he fails to pay. But to the rayat his ancestral acres are dear almost as life. To save them therefore he gladly agrees to any terms that the money-lender demands; and my belief is that fraud as between cultivator and money-lender is comparatively rare. There is no inducement to insert fraudulent conditions in the bond when the rayat, rather than lose his ancestral land, is perfectly willing to put his signature to much larger sums than he will ever be able to pay. Some philosopher has said that the easiest of all virtues is the confession of other men's sins; and this virtue our Indian administrators are ever ready to practice. Sir John Woodburn should remember the rebuke which Sir R Egerton, then Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, administered in 1879 to those who were then making a scapegoat of the money-lender. He pointed out in the Viceroy's Council that the peasant was driven into insolvency by the great stringency with which Government exacted its revenue as a fixed sum in cash at fixed times, and reminded his hearers of the parable of the mote and the beam, while he urged the revenue authorities to show the money-lender an example of moderation. The money-lender and the Civil Courts, no doubt, are the ultimate instrument of the rayat's destruction, but the originating cause of his ruin is to be found in excessive rent, and in the harsh, rigid, and unsuitable methods of revenue assessment and collection, which have paralysed his energies and placed him a helpless victim in the hands of his creditors. What are mainly wanted to relieve the rayat from indebtedness, are a reasonable rent secured by legislative enactment, methods of assessment and collection suitable to his circumstances, and Courts of conciliation and arbitration, instead of debt Courts on the European models. These reforms, with a well considered system of agricultural banks to supply him with cheap and sufficient capital to provide irrigation and manure, would go far to set the rayat on his legs again, and make him what he ought to be, a substantial and contented peasant proprietor.

Instead of this he is, as Sir Theodore Hope described him, "ruined, despairing, embittered"; and an alteration in the law of Contracts and the Evidence Act will be about as useful as a pill for earthquake. Sir John Woodburn is evidently on the wrong tack altogether. Instead of ascertaining facts he is going about asking opinions, and the only result will be the accumulation of endless correspondence, and the passing of some futile Act, which will not even touch the cause of the mischief. I shall watch with interest this new experiment in the art of how not to do it.

IS REGULATION XXV OF 1827 LEGAL?

By E. H. Pickersgill, M.P.,
Of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

MUCH has been both written and spoken respecting the alleged illegality of the imprisonment of the Natu brothers, based upon the construction to be put upon the Regulation under which they are detained; but, so far as I have observed, no one has yet specifically raised any question as to the legality of the Regulation itself. This I propose to discuss in the following article. In the first place it may be well to remove a misapprehension which appears to be widely prevalent. It has been stated in an English newspaper, which, as a rule is exceptionally well-informed upon Indian affairs, that "of course there is no such thing as a Habeas Corpus Act existing in India." Here it is evident that an importance is attached to the Habeas Corpus Act, 31 Charles II, to which that Act has really no claim. As Hallam pointed out long ago, "It is a very common mistake to suppose that this statute enlarged in a great degree our liberties, and forms a sort of epoch in their history. But though a very beneficial enactment, and evidently remedial in many cases of illegal imprisonment, it introduced no new principle, nor conferred any right upon the subject." In other words, the writ of *Habeas Corpus* is not dependent upon the Habeas Corpus Act; it derives its origin from a far more ancient and august source; and, in the cases which have arisen outside the United Kingdom, it has generally been held immaterial to enquire particularly whether that Act was or was not introduced into dominions of the Crown beyond the seas. Thus the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in the famous Canadian case in 1839 commences as follows:

> We consider it unnecessary to discuss the question whether the Habeas Corpus Act, 31 Car. 2. was introduced into Canada by 14 Geo. 3. The writ of *Habeas Corpus ad subjiciendum* was unquestionably introduced into Canada as part of the criminal law of England.

As regards India, the case seems to stand thus: The Charter of 1774 invested the Supreme Court with jurisdiction to issue writs of *Habeas Corpus*. That jurisdiction was, however, limited to cases where a person within the local limits of the ordinary jurisdiction of the Court, or a British European subject without those limits, complained of wrongful confinement. The High Courts of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, as successors of the Supreme Court, inherited from it a similar jurisdiction as regards writs of *Habeas Corpus*. But such jurisdiction no longer exists. It has been superseded by chapter 37 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which is entitled "Directions of the nature of a *Habeas Corpus*." These provisions are restricted to the cases of persons within the ordinary civil jurisdiction of the High Courts respectively. Outside those limits, a somewhat similar jurisdiction is given (by section 100 of the Criminal Procedure Code) to Presidency magistrates and sub-divisional magistrates. But the Regulation under which the Natu brothers are detained is expressly excepted from the jurisdiction in both cases. Thus I conclude that there is no Court in India to which application could be made to enlarge these gentlemen.

Let us now, then, turn our attention to a much more august quarter. The Court of Queen's Bench, in England, gave in 1861 a very remarkable decision. I refer to the proceeding which is entitled *In the matter of John Anderson* (reported in 30 *Law Journal*, Queen's Bench, page 129). There a writ of *Habeas Corpus* was issued to a gaoler in Canada, and the following passage occurs in the judgment of the Court:—

> The writ of *Habeas Corpus* has been issued even into dominions of the Crown in which there were local judicatures and local legislatures. Hence we feel that nothing short of legislative enactment depriving this Court of such a jurisdiction would warrant us in omitting to exercise it when we are called upon to do so for the protection of the personal liberty of the subject.

In consequence of this decision the Imperial Parliament passed the statute 25 and 26 Vict., c. 20. I invite the special attention of my readers to the precise terms of section 1 of this Act, which runs as follows:

> No writ of *habeas corpus* shall issue out of England into any colony or foreign dominion of the Crown where her Majesty has a lawfully established Court or Courts of Justice having authority to grant and issue the said writ, and to ensure the due execution thereof *throughout such colony or dominion.*

Now there is not, nor has there ever been, a court in British India having authority to grant and issue the writ of *Habeas Corpus* and to ensure the due execution thereof *throughout that dominion.* It is submitted, therefore, that the English prerogative writ of *Habeas Corpus ad subjiciendum* still runs in all parts of British India.

Having thus given reasons for believing that there is a court before which the question of the legality of the imprisonment of the Natu brothers might be raised, I now proceed to consider whether there are good grounds for such an application. With this view it will, in the first place, be convenient to set out in full the title, the main preamble, and the chief enacting sections of the Regulation—XXV of 1827—under which these gentlemen are detained. This is the more desirable inasmuch as, so far as I have observed, only isolated phrases have hitherto been quoted in English newspapers. The title of the Regulation, then, is as follows: "A Regulation for the confinement of State Prisoners and for the attachment of the Lands of Chieftains and others for reasons of State." The following is the main preamble:

> Whereas reasons of State, embracing the due maintenance of the alliances formed by the British Government with foreign Powers, the preservation of tranquillity in the territories of Native Princes entitled to its protection, and the security of the British dominions from foreign hostility and from internal commotion, occasionally render it necessary to place under personal restraint individuals against whom there may not be sufficient ground to institute any judicial proceed-

ings, or when such proceedings may not be adapted to the nature of the case, or may for other reasons be unadvisable or improper; and whereas it is fit that in every case of the nature herein referred to the measure adopted should emanate immediately from the Governor in Council.

Then the chief enacting sections are as follows:—

First. When any of the considerations stated in the preamble of this regulation may seem to the Governor in Council to require that an individual should be placed under restraint without any immediate view to ulterior proceedings of a judicial nature, it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council [provided always that, with reference to the individual, the measure shall not be in breach of British law] to cause such individual to be apprehended in such manner as the Governor in Council may deem fit, and when apprehended, to be delivered over to any officer in whose custody it may be deemed expedient that he shall be placed, with a warrant of commitment to such officer's address.

Second. The warrant of commitment shall be in the form specified in Appendix (A), and shall be sufficient authority for the detention of any State prisoner in any fortress, jail or other place within the zillas subordinate to Bombay.

Appendix (A).

To the (*here insert the officer's designation*).

Whereas the Governor in Council, for good and sufficient reasons, has resolved that (*here insert the State prisoner's name*) shall be placed under personal restraint at (*here insert the name of the place*): You are hereby ordered, in pursuance of that resolution, to receive the person above named into your custody, and to deal with him in conformity to the orders of the Governor in Council and the provisions of Regulation XXV A.D. 1827.

By order of the Governor in Council,
Bombay Castle, (Signed) A. B.
——day of——18—— Secretary to Government.

It will be observed that there is no reference in the Regulation showing under what Imperial Statute or authority it purports to be made. Upon this very important point, therefore, we are left to conjecture, which must be founded upon such arguments as are available. In this view it may not be irrelevant to point out that the passage in Section 1 of the Regulation which is enclosed within square brackets was repealed, except as to European British subjects, by Section 1 of Act III of 1858. It may, therefore, be inferred that the original Regulation applied to European British subjects. If this is so, then the Regulation now in question is differentiated from Regulation III of 1818, *i.e.*, the Calcutta Regulation dealing with the same object. The legality of the latter Regulation was raised before the Indian Courts in 1870 in the proceeding entitled *In the matter of Amir Khan* (reported in the sixth volume of the Bengal Law Reports, p. 392). There Mr. Justice Norman, in his judgment, said:—

Regulation III of 1818 having been passed by a legislative authority which had no power to bind European British subjects, it must be taken as applicable only to Natives and others subject to the jurisdiction of the provincial courts. It appears to have been passed under 37 Geo. III, c. 142, sect. 8.

But for the reason stated above, I hold that Regulation XXV of 1827 is differentiated from Regulation III of 1818, and I conclude that the former Regulation does not derive its authority from 37 Geo. 3, c. 142, sect. 8. Hence it is unnecessary that I should discuss in detail that Imperial statute. Apart altogether, however, from this particular argument, I should infer from the terms of the preamble to Regulation XXV of 1827 that, if it was made under any Imperial authority at all, that authority was Section 36 of 13 Geo. 3, c. 63. This section empowers the Governor-General and Council to make Regulations for "good order and Civil Government." I admit that in some cases such words have received a very wide interpretation from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But in every instance the whole context must, I think, weigh heavily in determining the construction. In this point of view I desire to call particular attention to a passage in the Minute of Sir E. Ryan, which (along with the Minute of Sir C. Grey) is included in the appendix of the Third Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons upon Indian Affairs, 1831-2. I may say, by the way, that both these Minutes are well worth perusal by anyone who desires to acquire succinct information on the difficult subject of the Judiciary in British India. The passage to which I refer sets out the construction put by a highly competent authority on Section 36 of 13 Geo. 3, c. 63. The passage runs as follows:

Looking first to the terms, *rules, ordinances, and regulations*, used in the granting part, which rather convey the notion of a power to carry into effect, by local and subordinate means and measures, the substance and spirit of laws already given, than to originate new laws: shackled also as the power is by the express prohibition that these local rules shall not be contrary to the laws of the realm—a restriction very difficult to adapt to local circumstances, and almost irreconcilable with any plain departure from the general spirit of those laws, however proper in different circumstances: and most of all looking at the power given to sanction the observance of such local rules *by fines, forfeitures, and corporal punishments*; the only construction which could safely be put upon this local legislating power was that it was to be confined to *mere police regulations* for preserving the peace, preventing and punishing nuisances, and the like; and was not to be extended to a general power of making original laws affecting the liberty or title to property of the inhabitants of Calcutta, including all descriptions, or even the laws, usages, and customs of the Native inhabitants.

The passage quoted above refers to the paramount safeguard which the Imperial legislature had interposed. The legislative power conferred upon the Governor-General in Council was subject to this restriction, that any Regulations which he made "must not be repugnant to the laws of the realm." Hence I think that the question of legality raised by the imprisonment of the Natu brothers is not concluded by the decision of the Indian Courts in Amír Khan's case in 1870—even assuming that case to have been rightly decided. There the decision mainly turned upon the construction to be put on the statute 3 and 4, William IV, where the restriction placed on the legislative authority is different, that is, the Regulations made must "not affect any part of the *unwritten* Laws or Constitution of the United Kingdom." Mr. Justice Norman himself recognised in his judgment the distinction upon which I am now insisting, for he said, "The 'unwritten law or constitution' of England is of more flexible character than Magna Charta."

THE PROPHET OF THE "FORWARDS."[1]

Sir Henry Rawlinson deserved the honour of a modest memorial volume. He was a great geographer and orientalist; he did immense service to learning by pioneer work on the various kinds of cuneiform inscriptions; and he was a distinguished soldier-political. Unfortunately for his fame, his biography has been delayed till its publication has become coincident with a boom of the Forward policy, which it was his unhappy chance to exert himself to revive. His biographer has thus given much prominence to this disastrous side of his activity. He has emphasised Sir Henry's own great illusion—the mistaking of a clever, energetic, and self-confident soldier-political for an imperial statesman.

Rawlinson was born at Chadlington in Oxfordshire on April 11, 1810. He belonged to an old Lancashire family. Obtaining a nomination to a cadetship under the East India Company, he embarked in 1827 for Bombay. On board ship he was fortunate enough to meet Sir John Malcolm, the Governor of his Presidency, who turned his attention towards Persia—the land, the language, the literature, and the history. It was his study of Persian that led to his selection in 1833 as one of the officers sent from India to Persia to aid in disciplining the Shah's army; and it was this appointment that drew him to the task of cuneiform decipherment. He took to an extensive course of reading and of linguistic study; but, like his father before him, he knew a good horse, and he threw himself with zest into all the sports of his set. In 1832, while quartered at Poona, he challenged "any rival, for the stake of £100, in running, jumping, quoits, racquets, billiards, pigeon-shooting, pig-sticking, steeple-chasing, chess, and games of skill at cards;" and no man accepted the challenge. He also won a bet of £100 by accomplishing a mad ride from Poona to Panwell, seventy-two miles, in three hours and seven minutes, the time limit being four hours. This was pretty well for a young man of twenty-two.

In 1833 he was stationed in Persia. Apart from his regulation work and his private studies, one would like to cite a few stories of daring adventure—such as his meeting with Bahir Khan at the cave of Shapur, or his visit to the shrine of Fatima in the sacred city of Kum, or his enterprise in securing cuneiform inscriptions, especially those on the Behistun rock. We must be content with one historically interesting episode. The Shah was on the march for Herat, and Rawlinson had been instructed to follow him up. After a ride of some 800 miles, he caught

[1] "A Memoir of Major-General Sir Henry Creswicke Rawlinson, Bart. K.C.B., F.R.S., D.C.L., etc. By George Rawlinson, M.A., F.R.G.S. With an Introduction by Field-Marshal Lord Roberts of Kandahar, V.C. With Illustrations. London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.

up the Shah at Nishapur, in Khorassan; and on the way he had fallen in with Vitkievitch, the Russian officer whose presence at Kabul a few months later helped to force on the Afghan War of 1839-42:—

The officer . . . . was a young man of light make, very fair complexion, with bright eyes and a look of great animation. He rose and bowed to me as I rode up, but said nothing. I addressed him in French . . . but he shook his head. I then spoke English, and he answered in Russian. When I tried Persian, he seemed not to understand a word; at last he expressed himself hesitatingly in Turcoman or Usbeg Turkish. I knew just sufficient of this language to carry on a simple conversation, but not to be inquisitive. This was evidently what my friend wanted; for when he found that I was not strong enough in Jaghatai to proceed very rapidly, he rattled on his rough Turkish as glibly as possible. All I could find out was that he was a *bonâ fide* Russian officer carrying presents from the Emperor to Mohammed Shah . . . .

In the course of conversation, mentioning to his Majesty my adventure of the morning, he replied: "Bringing presents to me! Why, I have nothing to do with him; he is sent direct from the Emperor to Dost Mohammed, of Kabul, and I am merely asked to help him on his journey." This is the first intimation we have ever had of a direct communication between Petersburg and Kabul, and it may be of great importance. The gentleman made his appearance in camp two days after my arrival, and I was then introduced to him by M. Goulte as Captain Vitkievitch. He addressed me at once in good French, and, in allusion to our former meeting, merely observed, with a smile, that "it would not do to be too familiar with strangers in the desert."

Diplomatic relations between Great Britain and Persia being broken off, Rawlinson's Persian experience pointed him out as fittest man to be political agent at Kandahar, and in this capacity he saw a good deal of the first Afghan war. The chapter on this period of his work presents some interesting sidelights, but nothing fresh that possesses essential importance. As he descended the Sutlej, he met with a very unfortunate accident, which may serve for a warning: the vessel containing all his Kandahar books and bills and vouchers was burnt, and it cost him no end of trouble to recall his customers and get duplicate vouchers. The Government took no account of the accident, and insisted on a full bill and complete vouchers as if no accident had taken place. He took brain fever over it. However, as he went down the Ganges, he had Lord Ellenborough for a fellow-traveller, and the Governor-General offered him his choice of the Residency at Nepal or the Central India Agency. His interest in his linguistic and archæological investigations was strong on him, and he preferred the less important political agency in Turkish Arabia. He stayed and studied at Baghdad for many years—1844-49 and again 1851-55. Returning to England, he was made a K.C.B., and was nominated a Crown Director of the East India Company in 1856; was M.P. for Reigate, Jan.-Sept., 1858; was appointed a member of the India Council in 1858; went next year to Teheran as ambassador, but rather hastily threw up the embassy in 1860, because it was transferred from the India to the Foreign Office; and was reappointed a member of the India Council, this time for life, in 1868. Academic honours were showered upon him for his well-known life-work in the various departments of cuneiform study and in geography. These studies constitute his real glory, and it is more than ample glory for any one man.

His false glory is associated with his famous "Memorandum" (1888) and his volume on "England and Russia in the East" (1874). Of course, Lord Roberts, in his very bald "Introduction," lays great stress on its importance; and it appears that Lord Lytton was Rawlinson's eager pupil, even after he had gone to Calcutta. With their wrong-headed policy we take nothing to do here; we have washed our hands absolutely clean of it, and the country is pretty well tired of it, if Ministers are not. We only repeat that it is totally inefficient for its declared purpose; and if it be persisted in, it will go nearer than any other folly to shake the British Empire, in India and out of India, to the very foundations. What we wish to do now is to draw attention to Canon Rawlinson's treatment of certain of its developments. Thus, he says:—

To have put up tamely with the long series of slights and insults in which Shir Ali had indulged himself from the time of the Seistan award in 1871, would have ruined the prestige of England among the nations of the East, and made her the laughing-stock of Asia. It would also have been a great encouragement to Russia to risk a bold stroke, and precipitate matters by a sudden advance from Turkestan upon Kabul and Herat.

Now, what were these "slights and insults?" What were the items in the alleged "series of affronts?" The only specification of them that we can find is this:—

Encouraged by Russia, Shir Ali, the Amír of Afghanistan, had offered to the Government of India a series of affronts, with which it was barely possible to put up, and these affronts culminated, in 1878, in the Amír's favourable reception and entertainment at his Court of a Russian Mission, sent by the Governor-General of Russian Turkestan, simultaneously with his repulse and rejection of an Anglo-Indian Mission, sent to him after due notice by Lord Lytton. Russia was under engagements, five times repeated, to ourselves, to "regard Afghanistan as wholly beyond the sphere of her influence," and the Amír was bound by treaty to consult us in all matters where his foreign relations were concerned; but in the summer of 1878, without previously giving us any notice or information whatever, he both received a Russian Mission under General Stolietoff into his capital, and also despatched a return embassy to the Russian headquarters at Tashkend, accredited to the Russian Commandant, General Kaufmann. He showed, in fact, every disposition to throw himself into the hands of Russia, and become entirely her catspaw, while he broke off altogether all pretence of friendly relations with us.

Now, we respect the Canon's broadcloth, but if any layman had written this caricature of history, we should plainly stigmatise it as discreditable. The "series" of affronts is not stated; it, in fact, does not exist, and never did. If Russia encouraged the Amír, where is the proof? And why did England not deal with Russia as such a breach of her fivefold engagement deserved? Why, because Russia did not encourage the Amír; and when Russia made explanations, England acquiesced in them. The Anglo-Indian Mission was refused on the express ground, and a grimly solid ground, that the Amír could not protect its members. The Russian Mission came uninvited; the Amír tried hard to stop it; but how could he possibly do otherwise than treat the members with civility? The Amír would have fervently thanked Allah to be rid of both missions equally. He was bound to consult us in his foreign relations, and he did consult our Viceroys, and frankly furnished every scrap of information he had. He showed no disposition to throw himself into the hands of Russia, and did not break off friendly relations with us; on the contrary he was anxious to keep friends with us, and Lord Lytton would not let him. We traverse emphatically each and every allegation in the Canon's strange statement.

The correspondence between Kaufmann and Shir Ali, which commenced in 1870 (not in 1871), was made no secret of by either party; it was mainly compliment and commonplace; and no objection was raised to it either at Calcutta or in London till the autumn of 1876. Lord Northbrook has publicly declared that down to the end of his Viceroyalty in April, 1876, there was no ground for suspecting Russian intrigue at Kabul through this correspondence; and Lord Lytton did not raise any difficulty till September. In November Disraeli fulminated his menace of three campaigns, but that was motived by the frustration of his policy in Eastern Europe. This is what led to the rejection of the Berlin Memorandum, to the very verge of war with Russia, and to the belated discovery of "intrigue" in the Kabul correspondence. The Government was hunting high and low for a plausible pretext. Mild expostulations were addressed to St. Petersburg, and on December 10 Disraeli said: "Remember Russia has taken every step in this business so as to make honourable amends to England; and her conduct," he added, "presents the most striking contrast to that furnished by the Amír." Russia being exculpated, it is hard to understand the guilt of Shir Ali.

Well, what did the Amír do? The Russian Mission, it is now known, was sent to force the Amír to choose definitively either the Russian or the English alliance. Why? Because Russia had become aware of the Government's intention of using Afghanistan as a basis of operations against her in Central Asia. That is to say, it was the action of the English Government, and not the Amír, that caused the Embassy to be sent. Cavagnari's diary bears witness to the Amír's anger, annoyance, and alarm, and to his anxious attempt to stop the Embassy—an Embassy, too, that the British Government presently admitted that Russia had the right to send! True, the Amír received it as became his own dignity and the dignity of a neighbouring Power that he had every reason not to insult. If he did not send information to Calcutta, it is to be remembered that Lord Mayo and Lord Northbrook had chalked out for him a general line of action; that Lord Lytton had withdrawn the British Agent; and that Lord Lytton anyhow knew on June 7, at least as early as the Amír could possibly have informed him. To suppose that the Amír imagined the Embassy could be kept secret is absurd. The Amír openly ex-

pressed his anxious desire for a British Envoy to consult with him, and he "would acknowledge without any grudging any blame which might be justly thrown on him." He was confident he could satisfy any reasonable man of his absolute innocence. Lord Lytton knew all this. Yet, instead of accommodating matters conciliatorily, he urged Lord Cranbrook to immediate action—that is, to insist on the Amír's reception of a British Mission. In spite of Lord Cranbrook's restraint, he precipitated the Government into war. The only excuse for Canon Rawlinson is that he may have been misled by Lord Cranbrook's most erroneous despatch of November 18, 1878. When he tells us that, with the treaty of Gundamak, "British honour had been vindicated, at a ridiculously small cost in money, and with almost no expenditure of blood. Russia had been discredited, and it might almost have been said disgraced," etc., we simply ask: Where is that treaty now? To say that "it was not until Lord Lytton had been recalled, and the Marquis of Ripon appointed Viceroy in his place, that any important disaster befell the British army," and in the next sentence to exculpate the Viceroy—this is scarcely within the extremest limits of the ingenuous. Let Canon Rawlinson sum up the material and moral costs of this infatuated policy, and place them against the results. The sum will be found to work out a shockingly negative quantity.

THE WEEK IN PARLIAMENT.

BY OUR OWN ONLOOKER.

It sometimes, and, indeed, generally, happens that members come back from a holiday either brisk and lively or at least with a semblance of brightness. There was nothing of the sort to be seen about the melancholy little group of members who turned up at Westminster on Monday. They seemed to be "unfriended, melancholy, slow," and crept like Shakespeare's schoolboy unwillingly to their places. Indeed, the first day did something to establish still further the unenviable reputation of this Session. Once more the Government set itself to get money, and once more the House was so complacent, or lazy, or indifferent, that by half-past eight the Government had obtained all it wanted, and the members went home. The talk had been chiefly about parks and palaces. As to the parks, one thing was made clear—the London County Council has done its work so well in the parks under its control as to make the management of the royal parks look very indifferent.

But when the talk came to palaces it was not long before the members began to talk about the one palace which interests them most—the palace of Westminster. How the good members do enjoy their little speeches about the House and its precincts. They are always the same. There is the unfailing joke about the Ladies' Gallery, then the reference to the smoke-room always produces the little cry of "Oh, oh," followed by the senatorial giggle. Each other room, reading, dining, and tea-room, and the terrace and all the other parts have their own little truisms, sacred to them by the right of long-established usage. I was a little interested to notice that some members want to have telegraphic instruments to show in the various rooms what is going on in the House. This is rather surprising, for I should have thought that the one attraction of those rooms is the fact that you do *not* know what they are doing in the House.

Mr. Gibson Bowles, like most other "funny men," can be very solemn on occasion, and he openly lamented that the attractions in the other parts of the House are so great as to keep members from their duty. I don't know what these attractions are. It is true you can get your hair cut and can have a bath on the premises, but there are no card rooms and no billiards, though they have been urgently asked for. It seems to me that Mr. Bowles has taken hold of the wrong end of the stick. The House is empty not because of the attractions outside, but because of the heart-breaking and deadly dulness within. While referring to this subject, I may refer to a rumour which has upset the equanimity of some. It is said that Sir Wilfrid Lawson means to push his opposition to the sale of intoxicating liquor on the premises to the length of prosecuting someone. I am not sure upon whom he will pounce—it may be the Chairman of the Kitchen Committee, or it may be the man who drinks most—but he is breathing out threatenings and slaughter.

A vaccination debate is always interesting and puzzling because of the violent contradictions to which it gives rise. That which one side hails as a revelation of providence the other denounces as a filthy fad. I am bound to say that the defenders of the system have the worst of it in one respect. They keep changing their ground, while the assailants always say the same. Only recently we were told that the arm to arm vaccination is the only true and safe system. Now this is thrown over. And so with many other matters, we are asked to burn what we used to be told to worship and to worship that which we burned. One important change introduced by the Government Bill is the arrangement by which prosecutions are in future to be undertaken by the vaccination officers and not by the guardians. Now everyone knows that many boards of guardians have been elected simply on the understanding that they will not prosecute. There are 122 boards of this way of thinking in the Kingdom. Yet the vaccination officer can in the teeth of their wishes prosecute defaulters at the expense of the ratepayers. Apart from the right or wrong of vaccination, this is a distinct illustration of distrust of or hostility to popular wishes.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, April 14.—Reports of European intervention between the United States and Spain were revived in Washington; but at the Embassies and Legations it was believed that war was inevitable. The Senate discussed the resolution reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. At a meeting of the Spanish Cabinet it was resolved to summon the Cortes to meet on Wednesday. It was stated that the watchword in official circles was to remain on the defensive, awaiting President M'Kinley's action; but the Spanish Court and several members of the Cabinet did not despair, or share the pessimist impressions prevalent in Spain, where the resolutions of the American Senate and Congress had aroused much indignation.

Both the employers and the men in the Welsh coal strike held conferences at Cardiff. At the Miners' Conference the chief question was whether their representatives, in treating with the owners, should have plenary powers to affect a settlement. A resolution referring the subject to the branches for their mandate was carried unanimously. At the conference of owners it was reported that there was perfect unanimity of action among the members of the Association, and the proceedings of the employers at the joint conference were fully approved. Plenary powers were granted to the Emergency Committee, and the announcement was made that the masters were in a strong financial position for carrying on the struggle.

Mr. Courtney, M.P., speaking at St. Neot, Cornwall, said he did not agree with those who charged Lord Salisbury with having been too yielding to France in the case of Siam, Tunis, and Madagascar. The policy pursued by the Prime Minister vindicated itself the moment it was carefully examined. There had been real danger of a rupture between England and France over the West African question, but it would be a scandal to Christianity and civilisation if the two leading nations of the world quarrelled and fought on such a matter. If necessary, arbitration should be adopted to settle the dispute.

Relations between masters and men in the South Wales coal trade appeared to be more strained. Miners were leaving for the North of England, and an urgent appeal was issued for funds.

A conference of Irish Peers and representatives of Grand Juries was held in Dublin for the purpose of considering the provisions of the Irish Local Government Bill. The Duke of Abercorn presided, and described the measure as of a revolutionary character, which abolished at one stroke a system of county administration by Grand Juries which had worked well. But he counselled acceptance of the inevitable, and recommended Grand Jurors and Unionists, while urging the Government to introduce safeguards, to hold themselves in readiness as candidates for the new representative bodies to be created.

Friday, April 15.—The debate in the Senate in Washington on the resolutions reported by the Foreign Relations Committee was continued, and an all-night sitting was probable with a view to a decision being arrived at to-morrow. Military preparations were being pushed forward as rapidly as possible, and about 20,000 men were to be shortly concentrated in Florida. The Washington correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle* stated that the Ambassadors of all the Powers, with the exception of England, were showing marked hostility to the United States. In Madrid, the action taken by the Spanish Government strengthened the belief that war was inevitable. The Foreign Minister was authorised to recall Señor de Bernabe from Washington the moment that the resolutions of Congress against Spanish sovereignty in Cuba were sanctioned by President M'Kinley. The Queen-Regent headed the national subscription for the increase of the Spanish navy with a contribution of a million pesetas. A Note was issued by the Government to the Powers explaining the situation and protesting against the resolutions of Congress.

The Pekin correspondent of the *Times* said that a concession had been granted by the Governor of Shan-si to an Anglo-Italian syndicate for working the vast coal and iron deposits of the province; but the validity of the concession was subject to regulations which will be imposed subsequently. The Russians had established a post-office, two hospitals, and a bank at Port Arthur, and enrolled 40 Chinamen as police. Two Japanese who arrived at Port Arthur on a Chinese gunboat were arrested and imprisoned as spies. There were seven Russian warships at

Port Arthur and four at Ta-lien-wan, where a force of infantry and Cossacks and two batteries of artillery was landed.

Sir Philip Magnus presided at a conference held by the National Association of Manual Training, and delivered an address in which he pointed out that the introduction of manual training was a very important step in the new educational movement, as illustrating the double proposition that hand and eye training was a mental discipline formative of serviceable moral habits, and that to learn to do was a higher lesson than to learn to know. What they had sedulously to avoid was any lapse into mechanical or routine methods. Manual instruction could not be considered as something outside the general curriculum, but must be accepted as an integral part of the new education. It was satisfactory to know that this view was at length recognised by the Education Department.

Saturday, April 16.—The debate in the Senate in Washington on the resolutions reported by its Foreign Affairs Committee with regard to Cuba was concluded to-night. Mr. Turpie's amendment, directing the Government to recognise the Republic of Cuba, was carried by 51 to 37 votes, and the resolutions of the Committee, thus amended, were passed by 67 to 21 votes, with an additional clause disclaiming any intention on the part of the United States to exercise sovereignty or jurisdiction over Cuba except for its pacification. The resolutions demanded that the Government of Spain should at once relinquish its authority in the island and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directed the President to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States to carry the resolutions into effect. This decision of the Senate was described as flinging down the gage of battle, not to Spain, but to the President and the House of Representatives. It was a vote for war, but offered one more chance of peace because it meant delay. The demand of the Senate for recognition of the Cuban Republic was an interference with the function of the Executive. It was not believed that the House would accept the Senate's resolutions in preference to its own. There would be a conference between the committees of the two Houses, and this and the subsequent endeavours to arrive at concurrence would involve delay, which would give time for calmer counsels. From Madrid it was stated that the Spanish Government had never taken a firmer stand in reference to Cuba than at Thursday's Council. Their attitude amounted to a flat rejection of President M'Kinley's claim to intervene. A war fever was prevalent, and there was a "semi-panic" on the Bourse. Most of the Madrid journals regarded war as inevitable.

Viscount Oxenbridge, who as Lord Monson acted for many years as one of the Liberal Whips in the House of Lords, died at the British Embassy in Paris. He was born in 1829.

Sunday, April 17.—Mr. Gladstone had a fair night on Saturday, but did not spend a very comfortable morning to-day. At the service at Hawarden Church the prayers of the congregation were asked for Mr. Gladstone, and also for peace between the United States and Spain.

Monday, April 18.—The United States House of Representatives, by a majority of 179 to 155, adopted a motion expressing concurrence with the Senate's Cuban resolutions, but with an amendment striking out the clause for the recognition of the Cuban Republic. The resolutions, thus altered, were taken to the Senate, which refused to agree to the alteration. The House of Representatives then proposed a conference, which was accepted by the Senate.—The Spanish Council of Ministers met to arrange for the assembling of the Cortes on Wednesday, and Señor Sagasta arranged matters with the object of securing united action on the part of all Spanish parties in the present crisis. In Madrid to-night a pessimist feeling prevailed. In Washington it was reported that the Representatives were again considering the desirability of intervening in the interests of peace.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer unveiled a white marble bust of the late Lord Randolph Churchill, which had been placed in the corridor of the members' staircase at the House of Commons. The cost of the bust was subscribed by members of all political parties. The right hon. gentleman, in performing the ceremony, said Lord Randolph, with rare courage and tenacity, had raised himself, in little more than the life of one Parliament, from the position of a private member to that of Leader of the House, which he had filled with remarkable ability and dignity. They had admired him as a brilliant orator and a great statesman, and had loved him as a friend, whose very faults made him only the more lovable. He was grateful for the opportunity of bearing testimony to the memory not only of a brilliant colleague, but also of a very dear friend.

The polling for the new general secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers closed this evening, when upwards of five hundred and fifty branches had made returns. The total poll was between twenty-nine thousand and thirty thousand, and although the exact result was not known, it was officially stated that Mr. Barnes had been returned by a large majority over all three of his opponents.

Tuesday, April 19.—The Conference Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives early this morning agreed to the Cuban Resolutions, as passed by the Senate, except the clause recognising the Cuban Republic, and the resolutions reached President M'Kinley in the afternoon. A meeting of the Cabinet was held, and it was resolved to prepare an Ultimatum to Spain, which was to be signed by the President on Wednesday morning. According to the latest report, Spain was to be given twenty-four hours to comply with the American demand. From Madrid it was stated that the Speech with which the Queen would open the Cortes on Wednesday would review the whole course of the relations between the United States and Spain, to show the persistent hostility of America, and would make an earnest appeal to all parties to gather round the throne, and vote the supplies necessary to defend the honour and territory of Spain. Señor Sagasta this afternoon addressed a meeting of Liberal Senators and Deputies, and urged that no time must be wasted in words, as the hour for action was approaching.

The votes cast for the secretaryship of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers were counted, and the result was declared as follows:—Mr. G. N. Barnes, 17,356; Mr. J. Anderson, 11,207; Mr. H. Barton, 851; Mr. W. Harmiston, 294.

The Law Courts reassembled, and the actions on the list numbered 633. The appeal of Mr. Hess from the decision of Mr. Justice Bruce in the libel action against Mr. Labouchere was allowed, and the case was consequently discontinued without the plaintiff having to answer further questions.

Wednesday, April 20.—President M'Kinley this morning signed the joint resolutions of Congress and also a despatch containing an ultimatum to Spain, to be presented immediately in Madrid by the American Minister. A copy was supplied to the Spanish Minister, who at once replied that the resolutions adopted by Congress and approved by the President were of such a character that his stay in Washington was impossible. He therefore applied for his passports, which were forthwith handed to him, and he left Washington this evening. President M'Kinley this morning requested the House of Representatives to pass at once the Bill authorising him to call for volunteers, and it was resolved to consider the Bill forthwith in Committee of the whole House.

It was reported that on Tuesday night Señor Sagasta held a meeting of the supporters of the Government in both Houses of the Cortes in Madrid and delivered an address, in which he characterised the action of the Washington Government as attempts on Spanish honour, menaces directed against her territory, and "the most infamous insult on record." The Cortes were opened to-day amid great enthusiasm by the Queen-Regent in person. In her speech from the Throne her Majesty said that more serious complications had arisen in Cuba through the action of people in the United States, who foresaw that the recent concession of autonomy would otherwise frustrate their schemes against the Spanish sovereignty. After referring to the efforts made in the interests of peace by the Pope and the Great Powers, her Majesty said that in view of the possibility that all those efforts might fail she had summoned the Cortes to defend the rights of Spain at whatever sacrifices might be involved. She appealed to them to defend her son's Throne till he was able to defend it himself, and expressed confidence that the nation would pass with honour and success through the crisis which it was sought to force upon them by provocations devoid of reason and justice.

It was understood that the ultimatum presented by General Woodford to the Spanish Government required an answer to be given by Saturday. General Woodford was making his preparations for departure to-day, but instructions had not yet been sent to him to quit his post. He would hand over the charge of American interests in Spain to the British Embassy. There was said to be no truth in the reports that the Cuban insurgents were disposed to make common cause with the Spaniards against American intervention.

MR. A. M. BOSE AT MANCHESTER.

ADDRESS TO THE MANCHESTER LIBERAL UNION

Mr. A. M. Bose was one of the principal speakers at the meeting of the Manchester Liberal Union, which was held on Friday last in the Reform Club, Manchester. The chair was taken by the President, Mr. C. P. Scott, M.P., and Mr. W. C. Steadman, M.P., was among those present. We take the following from the report printed in the *Manchester Guardian* of April 16.

Mr. C. P. Scott, M.P.

The President moved the following resolution:—"That this meeting of the Twelve Hundred of the Manchester Liberal Union deplores the results which have as a whole attended the foreign, colonial, and Indian policy of the Government—a policy of alternately oppressing the weak and making 'graceful concessions' to the strong—which has given rise to an unparalleled series of crises and complications, involving an expenditure on armaments beyond all precedent, and seriously compromising the honour and interests of the country. It

also condemns the policy of the Government in regard to home affairs on the ground of its reactionary character, and as being directed to class and sectional interests." In submitting the resolution, the President offered, on behalf of the Union, a cordial welcome to Mr. Bose and Mr. Steadman. Mr. Bose, he said, came to them as representing a vast community which was wholly unenfranchised, and Mr. Steadman might be said in a special sense to represent millions of our fellow-countrymen who had but lately received the franchise, and to whom it had not yet brought all that it ought to bring. It was a particular pleasure to welcome Mr. Bose, because they in Manchester were very closely linked with India and its interests, and all that affected its welfare was very dear to them. He thought the feeling was growing amongst the thoughtful men of this country, and certainly amongst the Liberal party, that the credit and self-respect of the country depended very largely on the manner in which we discharged our great and growing obligations to our Indian dependency. In view of these things they were specially glad to have a visit from one who had held a distinguished position in India as a member of the Legislative Council for one of the great provinces of India, who had full knowledge of the necessities of the country, and who, by the education he had received in one of our great universities, of which he was a Master of Arts, was well fitted to interpret to them the desires and needs of India. (Hear, hear.) The resolution found fault with the Government. But it was not enough to find fault with the action of their opponents. They had to bring forward a substantial programme of their own. (Hear, hear.) The task of the Liberal party was, first of all, to assert its principles, and be true to its traditions. Then when the time came for them to take power they would be able to fulfil the great task that was imposed upon them, for the good of the country. (Cheers.)

Mr. Alderman Guthrie, seconding the resolution, said that as to India, representatives of that great country ought to sit in the Imperial Parliament and exercise a voice in the direction of its affairs. (Cheers.) He said the same on behalf of the Colonies.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. Bose's Speech.

Mr. A. M. Bose, who was cordially received, moved the following resolution:—"This meeting strongly condemns the reactionary and repressive policy of the present Government in India, and in particular the imprisonment of British subjects without trial, the passing of a law which is dangerous to the liberty of the Press, and the attempt now being made to seriously curtail the privileges of municipal self-government hitherto enjoyed by the metropolis of India. In the opinion of this meeting, such a policy is likely to compromise the honour and the interests of the Empire, and should be reversed at the earliest opportunity." Mr. Bose thanked the meeting for the heartiness of his reception, and ventured to do so, he said, not simply on his own behalf but on behalf of the millions of his fellow-countrymen in India. It was an especial pleasure to be associated with Manchester Liberals on the occasion of their annual gathering, for close as was the connexion between India and England, closer and more intimate was the connexion between Lancashire and his country, and anything that affected the peace and prosperity, the progress, moral and material, of India must necessarily be a matter of profound interest to Lancashire. (Cheers.) He did not know whether they claimed for Manchester the position of the first city in the Empire, but as a boy out in India he heard of Manchester long before he heard of London—(hear, hear)—and one of his earliest attempts at the English alphabet was in spelling out the letters of the word Manchester stamped on a bale of cotton goods. He was glad to have an opportunity of speaking in the home of a newspaper which was received with love and regard all over India for its strenuous advocacy of the claims of the people of that vast country; and while he was glad to acknowledge the debt of gratitude they owed to the *Manchester Guardian*, he hoped that paper would not be the solitary champion of their interests. How did England hold India? It had 75,000 troops there, but what were these among a population of three hundred millions? The foundation of British rule was something prouder and more glorious than its bayonets; it was the confidence the people of India had in the justice of the people of England when they took the trouble to know the facts. He was afraid they were not always ready to do this, and the result was disastrous; for, as Lord Roberts had said, one act of injustice in India did more to sap the foundations of the Empire than a lost battle. How about the confidence of the people of India in the justice of England while the present Government had been in power? The Government had been doing their level best to destroy the confidence and to lower the prestige of England. He would not go into the question of the war on the North-West frontier; the authors of it seemed to be thoroughly ashamed of the results of their policy. He said nothing as to the cruelty and futility of the war, but he must say a word as to the cost of it. In spite of the fact that the war had been undertaken on grounds of Imperial policy, it was India, and India alone, that was to bear the cost. Was that right? (No.) On the contrary, he thought there was a special tinge of meanness about the idea that a country which had been visited by the three-fold calamity of famine, pestilence, and war should be made to pay, while rich and powerful England escaped all the financial burden. In the case of India, the doles to which Mr. Steadman referred had been given to the West India sugar-planters, and not in such quarters as justice and equity would have suggested. It had not been given in such quarters because India had no voice in the matter. (Hear, hear.) He would not elaborate that matter, but would read one sentence from the *Saturday Review*, a journal which ordinarily was a supporter of the policy of the Government. In an article referring to the refusal of the Government to contribute any portion of this expenditure, the *Saturday Review* of February 26, said: "It is a miracle that in the face of such acts of injustice as this we can still maintain our Imperial rule in India." He need not paint the lily nor gild refined gold. He would therefore leave the policy of the Government to this condemnation, emphatic and pronounced, from the pen of the Saturday Reviewer. He would turn now to a consideration of some matters of internal administration deserving attention. If we were to read to-morrow that a British subject had been sent to gaol by the Sultan of Turkey without trial, without any intimation of the charges brought against him, the indignation of the whole of England would be roused, and if the Sultan persisted in detaining that British subject in prison without trial the might of England would be exerted to free him from the clutches of that ruler. Yet, would it be believed, at the present time there were men in India—two influential, highly respected citizens in that Empire—who had been kept in prison for eight or nine months without trial, under the orders of some of the Government officials? Could anyone believe that such a thing was possible where the flag of England floated? That which was intolerable if done by a Sultan or by a Turkish pasha was good enough, apparently, for British officials. He was sure that was not a method of government that commended itself to the conscience or the judgment of an English audience. (Hear, hear.) And people who could act in that way resented the criticism of the Press upon their doings; so a law had been passed within the last two months that if an editor wrote anything which excited or might tend to excite a feeling of contempt or ill-will or disaffection—and disaffection had been defined as a want of affection—towards the Government he was liable to transportation for life. (Shame.) There was no check of public opinion on the acts of the Government in India, and now there could be no criticism. The result was a policy of injustice and reaction. In interfering with the freedom of the Press, as they were doing, the Government were sitting on the safety-valve and seriously imperilling the good government and administration of India. For in India, much more than in this country, the Press was the only channel by which the desires of the people could be made known to the rulers and administrators. It was a crying shame that the rights of personal liberty and of freedom of speech should have been filched away from the people as they had been within the past few months. Mr. Bose also referred in condemnatory terms to the action of the Government of India in seeking to diminish the representation of the people on the Municipal Corporation of Calcutta. Hitherto the people had had the right of electing two-thirds of the members, the Government selecting one-third and appointing the chairman. Now it was proposed that the Government should choose two-thirds, leaving the people to elect the remainder. Could any policy, he asked, be more unworthy of our traditions of public life? He trusted there would be such a protest from this and other meetings that the Government would hesitate to carry out a policy of this character. There might be differences of opinion as to the course which further progress in India should take, but there could be no question that the concessions, few and feeble as they were, which had already been made to the freedom of the people of India should not be taken away or diminished. (Hear, hear.) And, speaking as one who loved both England and India, and whose earnest endeavour was to bring the two countries closer together and to make India a source of strength and not of weakness to England, he ventured to warn the Government that this policy of taking away liberties long enjoyed was a policy full of danger to the best and highest interests of the Empire. (Cheers.) The final responsibility for this policy, which was worthy of the Dark Ages, rested with the English people themselves, for it was they who made and could unmake governments. At present they had come in India to the parting of the ways. Were they to follow the policy adopted by the administrators of the past, a policy of trust in and sympathy with the people of India, or a policy of mistrust and suspicion, of force and coercion? If the latter, it was doomed to disastrous failure, as sure as there was a power in this world which made for righteousness. (Cheers.)

Dr. Woodcock, by whom the motion was seconded, said he believed that Mr. Bose would not appeal in vain to the sympathies of the people of this country.

Mr. Arthur A. Haworth briefly supported the motion. He said it was much to be regretted that we should take our ideas of India to such an extent as we did from the Anglo-Indian, whose views were too often sadly perverted. His own experience of Anglo-Indians taught him that, although they

might be Liberals when they went out to India, they invariably returned filled with Tory ideas.

The resolution was unanimously passed.

A vote of thanks to Mr. Steadman, M.P., and Mr. Bose for their addresses, and to Mr. C. P. Scott, M.P., for presiding, was then passed, and the meeting separated.

Commenting on Mr. Bose's speech, the *Manchester Guardian* (April 16) wrote:—

At last night's meeting of the Manchester Liberal Union, attention was called by Mr. Bose to a serious matter which, we fear, has been hitherto almost over-looked. Two-thirds of the members of the Calcutta Corporation are now elected by the citizens; the others, as well as the chairman, are appointed by the Government. It is proposed to reverse these proportions and to allow the inhabitants of Calcutta to elect only a helpless minority of one-third. In short, the city has had local self-government, and now it is to be taken away. The self-government, it is true, was qualified by a bureaucratic element, and the bureacratic Government which it is proposed to put in its place would be qualified by a popular element, but the gist of the change is that while the elected members can always carry the day now, they could never carry it against the Government's nominees after the change was made. The proposal is quite of a piece with the new law for silencing inconveniently critical Indian newspapers, and with the revival of the practice of imprisoning persons who have done nothing indictable, but whom the Government dislikes or fears. It is notoriously one of the greatest difficulties of Indian government that the native population is almost inarticulate, and that it is often almost impossible to learn precisely how it regards the actions of its rulers. To overcome this difficulty a sagacious Government cuts down the liberties of the Press, holds vague terrors over Native public men distinguished by their success in formulating the wishes and complaints of their fellow-citizens, and finally proposes to refuse the citizens of Calcutta any effectual voice in their municipal affairs. British public opinion is incredibly apathetic about these measures of headlong reaction in India.

THE "PIONEER" ON LORD ROBERTS.

Under the title "Confusing the Issues," the following article upon Lord Roberts's recent speech in the House of Lords appears in the *Pioneer Mail* (April 1):—

The speech of Lord Roberts in the full dress debate in the House of Lords on March 8th, a full report of which is contained in the mail papers, is certainly a remarkable performance. For one thing it was an extraordinary effort of memory. Some of the audience were impressed by the fact that his lordship never referred to the notes he held in his hand, and when we learn, as we do, on the authority of the "gallery-man" of the *Saturday Review*, that it was delivered as it had previously been written, with the mistake of only a single word, we may concede that the quality of genius which consists in a capacity for taking pains has not yet forsaken our late Commander-in-Chief. Our business, however, is with the matter of the speech rather than with the manner of its delivery, and in this regard the result of a careful perusal is to produce a sensation of absolute bewilderment. We had read the notice of motion "to call attention to the papers on this subject (the North-West frontier) recently presented to Parliament"; and we were curious to see how Lord Roberts would succeed in turning the facts contained in these papers to the purpose he had in view. As a matter of fact the noble and gallant lord ignored these papers altogether; there is not the smallest evidence in his speech that he ever read them; on the contrary, almost every argument he advanced can be demolished by simple reference to the events with which they deal, and from their pages several statements which Lord Roberts makes as if they were matters of common notoriety, can be positively disproved. Perhaps it is no great matter for surprise that men like Lord Roberts and Sir George White should be found on the side of an extreme forward policy. It may be, as a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* puts it, in reviewing Lord Roberts's career in India, that "it would be contrary to human nature if the military vote in the Indian Government were not usually cast in favour of a bold and forward policy and in support of movements that expand the ever-widening margin of our North-Western frontier." But in the present instance Lord Roberts is challenging the verdict of English public opinion not as a soldier, but as a statesman, and we might fairly have expected that he would take the trouble to acquaint himself with the facts and arguments put forward by the critics of the policy he espouses, especially as these facts and arguments are to a great extent to be found in the official papers upon which he professed to base his case. We do not for a moment doubt that Lord Roberts was perfectly honest in all he said; but he made up his mind on these matters long before he left India, and seems to proceed on the complacent assumption that nothing can happen to upset his theories.

One assertion, for instance, is that the "inhabitants of the central section of the border" have "clearly proved by the part they have taken in the late disturbances the absolute failure of the policy of non-interference." "For," Lord Roberts went on, "so perfectly was the policy of non-interference tried with the bordermen, especially with the Afridis, that their country was, until the other day, a *terra incognita* to us; and so anxious were we to avoid giving them the slightest cause for suspicion that we wished to interfere with their independence, that the political officer in the Khyber, who commanded the Khyber Rifles and was responsible for the pass being kept open, was strictly prohibited from going to the right or left of the narrow road which leads through the pass; and the only British officer who ever ventured to enter Afridiland before Sir William Lockhart's force went there, was punished by being removed from his appointment. We gave the Afridis large sums for permitting kafilas to go backwards and forwards once a week through the Khyber Pass for trading purposes, and we paid them an annual subsidy for allowing us to make use of the shortest route between Peshawar and Kohat, which runs through a corner of their land, and which they closed against us whenever it pleased them to do so, greatly to our inconvenience and annoyance. Is it possible for non-interference to be carried further?" Now it is perfectly true that we did not interfere directly with the Afridis; but we interfered in the Kurram, the Tochi, on the Samana, and in Swat, and the petitions and complaints of the tribesmen all along the border show that suspicion of our intentions, if it did not wholly explain the recent disturbances, was a potent contributory cause. As the Amír put it in one of his letters to the Government of India: "Apparently the complaints of these people are against the local frontier officers of India;" and it is as clear as noon-day from the recently published Blue-book, nay it is expressly admitted by Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick in a reference to one of the ablest of their number, that interference with the tribesmen was one of the settled and avowed aims of these officials. To say that the recent disturbances prove the "absolute failure" of the older policy of non-interference is merely perverse. From 1848 to 1878 that policy was tried, and was found to be fairly effective and economical. Moreover it was becoming every year more effective, or expeditions on the frontier would not have gradually diminished both in number and importance up to the time of its abandonment. To quote Lord Northbrook:—"It was said by some that there were twenty-eight punitive expeditions in the first thirty years of our occupation of the Punjab. The result, however, of an examination was to show that in the first ten years there were nineteen punitive expeditions, in the second ten years five, in the third only four, and during the time he had the honour of filling the office of Viceroy, and in the time of his predecessor, Lord Mayo, there was only one. Since the war with Afghanistan there had been only two such expeditions, and therefore he asserted, without the slightest fear of contradiction, that the Punjab system of dealing with the tribes had been perfectly successful in this—namely, that on the whole these raids by the tribes had ceased to any great extent."

Again, Lord Roberts invites our attention to the fact "that throughout the present unusual frontier excitement not a shot has been fired in that part of Baluchistan which is under our control, or in Chitral, where British officers have been in direct communication with the tribes." Now, we are not prepared to deny that if we occupied all the border territory as we have occupied Baluchistan: that is, if we built huge cantonments, planted down large garrisons, and built great railways like the Bolan and the Harna lines, we could establish the *Pax Britannica* from Kurrum to Chitral; but Lord Roberts does not even attempt to show where the men and the money required for such a policy are to come from. What we do assert is that no middle policy is likely to be as effective as the old policy of vigilant non-intervention, and we ground the assertion on the experience of the last eight years, during which the frontier has been in an almost constant turmoil. Lord Roberts speaks of Chitral. Has he read the despatch of Major Deane of June 9, 1897, where we have the following:—"The Mehtar Shuja-ul-Mulk, presuming on the independent position which Government have given him, had collected about himself men notoriously hostile in their feelings to Government, two of them being leaders who had taken part in the Reshun and Koragh defile massacres. I ordered these men and one other to go to their homes at once, and in future not to visit him without the permission of the Assistant Political Agent. This was necessary, as the Mehtar has secretly done his best to discourage men from visiting the Assistant Political Agent. He has ignored the advisers appointed by Government to assist him except when absolutely driven to take notice of them by the Assistant Political Agent, and altogether his attitude was such that a continuance of it could only compel Government in the course of two or three years to depose him. The Mehtar further seemed blind to the fact that he was gathering about him men most likely to be interested in bringing his career to an untimely end." Is this a situation to be contemplated with that serene satisfaction it seems to have given Lord Roberts? Is it not rather clear that only a fear of our garrison keeps the Chitralis in check; and that the idea of their being reconciled to our "influence," or their supposed appreciation

of the advantages of our rule is purely imaginary? Again:—"So anxious was the Government of India not to be drawn on that in some instances positions taken up were abandoned, only to be of necessity re-occupied later on; and each successive Viceroy, Liberal and Conservative alike, has been compelled to move forward, whether he wished it or not." In support of this assertion, where it will be seen the doctrine of the "inexorable decree," so much in favor with frontier politicians of the extreme forward school, again creeps in. Lord Roberts gives a brief review of frontier history from 1873 to 1897, and concludes:—"Thus we see that five out of six Viceroys, beginning with Lord Northbrook, were unanimous in their opinion as to the wisdom of our having control over the Gilgit frontier, and that four of them found it necessary to extend that control to Chitral." Lord Northbrook was present, and when he rose to speak he not only repudiated the suggestion that the developments of recent years could with any fairness or propriety he linked with the policy of his viceroyalty; but he pointed out (as we have more than once done since this controversy began) that Lord Roberts, the Commander-in-Chief and member of the Viceroy's Council, was a very different person from Sir Frederick Roberts, the author of the memorandum on frontier policy published in 1881. "An opinion expressed by a most distinguished authority in 1881 was not the same as that now expressed by the noble and gallant lord. That authority declared that the position at Kandahar, on the flank of any possible advance by Russia, was the essential position; that it would not be wise to distribute our forces; and that we should remain simply on the defensive on the North-West Frontier. Possibly circumstances had changed since then; but he doubted whether they had changed sufficiently to affect the main principle of strategy then laid down. Our energies were to be mainly devoted to striking vigorously on the Kandahar side; as we had neither sufficient men nor material to warrant our defending on more than one line. This high military authority also said, 'It may not be very flattering to our *amour propre*, but I am sure I am right in saying that the less the Afghans see of us the less they will dislike us.' The distinguished officer who said all that was Sir Frederick Roberts, just after he had come back from Kandahar." Similarly, when Lord Ripon spoke, he pointed out that our troops were withdrawn from the Kurrum "on the recommendation of Lord Roberts himself." Between 1880 and 1890 the geography of the North-West frontier had not changed so materially that principles of strategy which Lord Roberts in the former year declared to be not only doubtful but dangerous, became in 1890 absolutely axiomatic. The real explanation why, in later years, Viceroys have been forced to advance "whether they liked it or not," is given in the recent Blue-book and the papers published after the Chitral expedition. They show that the forward policy in the extreme sense of the term has been an abnormal development for which frontier officials and the Foreign Office have been directly responsible, and against which we see the Government of India vainly struggling. Lord Roberts himself was a member of the Viceroy's Council in 1892 when a despatch was sent to the Kashmir Resident warning him that interference in Chitral was to be avoided. We have seen quite lately that the weightiest opinion in Lord Elgin's Council was dead against the advance in Waziristan; and we know that still more lately, when Major Deane asked for the occupation of the Adinzai Valley beyond the Malakand, the Government of India declined. The suggestion that the reasonableness and even the necessity of a policy of absorption and occupation have been virtually admitted, with temporary lapses subsequently repaired, by the Government of India for a quarter of a century back, is wholly unwarranted by anything to be found either in the Blue-book to which Lord Roberts rose to call attention, or in any other Blue-book that has ever seen the light.

The grounds on which Lord Roberts really rests his arguments, in truth, are not in the nature of deductions made from the experience gained in the management of the frontier tribes; they are essentially postulates of a small coterie of strategists which the enthusiasts of the school mistake for military axioms or fundamental political principles. Lord Roberts states the position in brief when he asks us to believe that the policy "is necessitated by the incontrovertible fact that a great European Power is now within striking distance of our Indian possessions, and in immediate contact with a State for the integrity of which we have made ourselves responsible." As we have repeatedly pointed out, this supposed "necessity" is not a necessity at all. There are military experts of the first eminence who deny that we should be better able either to resist an attempted invasion or to fulfil our obligations to the Amír by taking up more advanced positions in the tribal country. Lord Roberts makes much of the 200,000 tribesmen who inhabit the borderland; they are mentioned now as "fighting men" and again as "tried warriors"; and we are asked to believe that if we fail to extend our influence over them, they will close the passes against us should we ever wish to send an army into Afghanistan. "Throughout the last Afghan war, so persistently were we harassed by the tribesmen that the greater number of the troops employed were occupied in keeping open the lines of communication. On the Peshawar-Kabul line alone between 11,000 and 12,000 men were required, and, as I told the Viceroy at the time, had there been anything like combination or organisation among the tribes, that number would have had to be doubled." Here, again, Lord Roberts, if he consults the recent Blue-book, will find that hundreds of men from our own district of Peshawar fought against us at the Malakand. Surely, if we attempt to extend our influence up to the Durand line, the chances are that the 200,000 "tried warriors" will turn against us the moment a good opportunity offers. If, on the other hand, it is a question of fulfilling our bargain with the Amír, there is no likelihood of our being harassed if we only leave the tribesmen alone. The papers recently published show that they are ready enough to take their orders from Kabul, so long as these orders do not involve interference with their independence. In a word, if we look at the matter from the point of view of border control, the lessons to be drawn from recent experience are all against Lord Roberts, and if we look at it from the point of view of Imperial defence, there is as much to be said for the old policy as the new. It is then that the question of expense comes in, and it becomes obligatory on the statesman, as distinguished from the soldier, to enter a protest against a policy which must involve an ever-increasing expenditure for the attainment of objects which can be equally well-secured by other and less costly means. Lord Roberts makes no allusion to the financial aspect of the question at all. It is hardly necessary to say that this omission alone would prevent us regarding his speech as a statesmanlike effort to discuss the question with which it deals.

We notice that in the debate in the Imperial Legislative Council on Monday, the Viceroy made some reference to the question of frontier management and frontier policy. His Excellency tells us no Government of India has ever "professed" a policy of absorption and annexation. "It has never been raised in my time. During the time I have known the Government of India, I maintain that we have never made an advance or sent out a military expedition which has not been forced upon us by obligations which we could not honourably ignore; and I feel bound to add that in our deliberations, the first voice for peace, where it was honourably possible, was that of the late Commander-in-Chief." Now nobody has ever said the Government of India as a Government "professed" a policy of absorption and annexation; that is exactly what they have not done; but it is nevertheless a fact that this policy is the policy of many of their ablest frontier officers; it is also the avowed policy of the two last Commanders-in-Chief; and during the last ten years it has carried the day with the Government of India. It is all very well to tell us Sir George White's voice was always for peace; we do not doubt it. What we are certain of is that his opinians as to the best way of administering the frontier were bound to lead to war. Lord Elgin implies that no important advance on the frontier has been taken in his time which was not forced on Government by honourable obligation. Are we to believe that when Sir Antony MacDonnell, Sir James Westland, and Sir Charles Pritchard dissented from the decision of Lord Elgin's Government to occupy Wano they were advising a course which was dishonourable? The idea is preposterous. Profess a policy of absorption and annexation! Why the main objection to the Government of India's attitude in regard to frontier matters is that they have had no policy at all; that they have been at the mercy of energetic and ambitious frontier officials, that they have always suffered themselves to be compromised by the *fait accompli*. It may be unpleasant for a Viceroy to admit this; but unpleasant or no, it is a fact to be verified from the published Blue-books.

Imperial Parliament.

Tuesday, April 19.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petitions against State regulation; from Dundee, Crouch Hill, Govan, Bristol, Calton, Glasgow, and Weston-super-Mare (six), Wells, Weston-super-Mare (two), Kilbarchan, and Garforth; to lie upon the Table.

ANOTHER FAMINE BLUE-BOOK.

East India (Famine),—Copy presented—of Further Papers regarding the famine and the Relief Operations in India during the years 1897-8. No. VII [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LAND REVENUE ADMINISTRATION IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could state the number of evictions for non-payment of land assessment in the Presidency of Madras during the last ten years and the previous ten years, and the amount realised by the sale of the personal and real property respectively of the defaulters:

Whether he was aware that Mr. Clark, Deputy Commissioner of Settlement in Madras, reported in 1894 that, in consequence of the inequalities he had found in the mode of assessment, he recommended that the whole of the soils in the delta should be reclassified:

Whether the classification of soils for land assessment in the Madras Presidency was made on the same principles as in the Bombay Presidency; and, if not, what were the differences and the grounds for such differences:

Whether this matter had been brought under the notice of the Madras Government repeatedly during the last six years; and, if so, what was their reply:

And, whether he could state the quantity of arable land lying waste and available for cultivation in the Madras Presidency were due encouragement afforded by low rates of assessment for the agricultural population to take it up.

Lord G. Hamilton: If the honourable gentleman will allow me, I will send him a memorandum on the subject of the many questions he has put to me, as it is difficult to compress the necessary information within the limits of a reply to a Parliamentary question.

THE NEW STAMP ACT.

Mr. Samuel Smith asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Indian Government were proposing that all acknowledgments of debt exceeding 20 rupees, which under the existing law were liable to a fixed duty of one anna, should, when attested by a witness, be liable to an *ad valorem* duty as a bond of its amount:

And whether, as it was customary in India for such documents to be witnessed, the Government had taken into consideration that poor persons would suffer heavily by the payment of heavy stamp duties, or otherwise be deprived of an important safeguard from fraud.

Lord G. Hamilton: The provision in the Bill to amend the law relating to stamps to which the honourable member refers has been altered by the Select Committee. All acknowledgments will now continue to be liable to a duty of one anna only unless they include a promise to pay or some agreement of that nature. If they contain such a promise or agreement they are bonds and must be stamped as such—under the old law as well as under the law now proposed. I do not understand that the Government of India ever intended to alter the law but only to make it clearer.

Thursday, April 21.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petitions against State regulation from Shawford, Fairfield, Bridge of Allan, and Bannockburn; to lie upon the Table.

THE BUDGET STATEMENT AND DISCUSSION.

On the motion of Sir Henry Fowler a return was granted for Copy of the Indian Financial Statement for 1898-9, and of Proceedings of the Legislative Council of the Governor-General thereon.

OFFICIALS AND PUBLIC IN POONA. SUGGESTED RELEASE OF THE NATU BROTHERS.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the farewell demonstrations accorded at Poona to Colonel Creagh, the President of the Plague Committee, and his colleagues, to express the gratitude of the people for the tact and skill with which he had carried out the plague operations, thereby winning the esteem and confidence of the whole community:

And, whether, looking to the good feeling and harmony now established in Poona as the result of Colonel Creagh's sympathetic administration, he would consider whether the time had come when the release of Sirdar B. R. Natu and his brother might be sanctioned.

Lord G. Hamilton: I am aware that public demonstrations have taken place at Poona to express the gratitude of the Native community for the skill and success with which Colonel Creagh and his colleagues have suppressed the plague in that town and its vicinity, and I read with special interest one of the statements made by the head of the Municipality to this effect: "Of the soldiers and the valuable services rendered by them to the city, and their kind behaviour towards the poor Natives whose houses they helped in searching and whitewashing, I cannot speak too eulogistically." The language as well as the general feeling of the community is a marked contrast to the conditions existing a few months back in the same town and previous to the arrest of the Sirdars Natu. As I have before said, the detention of the Natus will continue until the Government of Bombay are satisfied that the public tranquillity will not be endangered by their release.

Mr. MacNeill asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, having regard to the fact that the brothers Natu had been kept in close imprisonment without charge and without being brought to trial from the 27th November last, now that all grounds for the apprehension that they would impede the execution of the plague regulations had ceased, the Government of India would take steps for the immediate trial of these men or would promptly direct their release.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have already stated, and have to-day repeated in reply to the question of the hon. member for Banffshire, that the detention of the Sirdars Natu will continue until the Government of Bombay is satisfied that the public tranquillity and order will not be endangered by their release. I have no intention of interfering with the discretion of that Government; but I will add that I am not aware of the reasons which the hon. member has for stating that the apprehension referred to in his question had ceased to exist.

THE EXECUTION OF DAMODHAR CHAPEKAR. WHY CONTINUE THE PUNITIVE FORCE AT POONA?

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had received confirmation of the news telegraphed from Bombay to the effect that Damodhar Chapekar, convicted of the murder of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst had been executed:

And, whether there was evidence of any general conspiracy having existed leading to those murders; and, if not, whether he would now direct the withdrawal of the punitive police costing the city of Poona Rs. 230,400.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have not received any official confirmation of the news referred to in the first branch of the question, nor have I been officially informed as to the evidence adduced at the trial. But the question at issue related to Chapekar alone, and I do not consider that the absence of evidence of a general conspiracy in any way disproves the necessity for maintaining a special force of police.

THE COST OF THE PLAGUE. THE SUPREME GOVERNMENT AND THE MUNICIPALITIES.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to the correspondence which had recently passed between the Government of India and the Bombay Government with reference to the expenditure incurred in combating the plague:

And, whether, looking to the importance to the whole of India of localising the plague, he would direct the Government of India to pay a substantial portion of the sums which in the meantime had been disbursed on this account by the municipalities.

Lord G. Hamilton: I am aware that there has been correspondence between the Bombay Municipality, the Bombay Government, and the Government of India, regarding the allocation of plague expenditure in Bombay City. I await a report on the subject from the Government of India before coming to a decision as to the apportionment of the expenditure; but I am able to say that the supreme Government fully recognise the national importance of the plague campaign conducted in Western India.

STATE REGULATION OF VICE IN INDIA.

Mr. James Stuart asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had received a memorial, signed by seventy-nine registered medical women practising in the United Kingdom and in India, protesting against the measures recently enacted for dealing with venereal diseases in the Indian army.

And, whether he would lay this memorial upon the Table of the House in continuation of the Parliamentary Paper, East India Accounts and Papers, Memorials, and Representations, C. 8495, 415 and C. 8402 of last Session.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have received the memorial referred to by the hon. member, and it will shortly be presented to Parliament.

The following notices of motion appear in the order-book of the House of Commons:—

Mr. Herbert Roberts,—On Second Reading of India Office (Store Depôt) Bill, to move, That it be read a second time upon this day six months.

Mr. Herbert Lewis,—On Second Reading of India Office (Store Depôt) Bill, to move, That it be read a second time upon this day six months.

Secretary Lord George Hamilton,—After Second Reading of India Office (Store Depôt) Bill, to move, That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two by the Committee of Selection:

That all Petitions against the Bill presented Three clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents, be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill:

That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records:

That Three be the quorum.

Mr. Pickersgill,—East India (Penal Code.)—That an humble Address be presented to her Majesty, praying that her Majesty will be pleased to disallow the Indian Penal Code Amendment Act, 1898.

We take the following from the awards issued on Wednesday by the Council of Legal Education upon the Easter Pass Examination:—

Pass Certificates.—Lincoln's Inn: Noshirvan B. Behramjee, Krishnaji W. Bhat, Brij B. L. Bisya, Devi Dayal, Abdul Karim Khan, Rahimkhan Karim Khan, Surendra Lal Khastgir, Beni Parshad Khosla, Jayavant Dinanath Madgavkar, Behari Lal Merh, Syed Mohamed Shere. Inner Temple: Pestonjee Sorabjee Patuck. Middle Temple: Vasudeo Ramkrishna Pandit, Abdul Rasul. Gray's Inn: Madhu Sudan Bhagat, Mohammad Said Hakim, Pagadala Rungiah Naidu, Des Raj Sahni, Shadi-Lal, Subharama Swaminadhan, Rastamji Kharshedji Tarachand.

The following passed in Constitutional Law and Legal History only:—Lincoln's Inn: Merwanji Rustomji Boyce. Inner Temple: Jijaba Bajaram Patil Mohite. Middle Temple: Kanji Premji Dodia. Gray's Inn: Raghubar Dayal, Anandarai Bapubhai Majmundar, Laxmidass Rowji Sapat, Harichund Nathubhoy Shah, Cullyanji Murarji Thacker, and Manilal Umedram Thakore.

The following passed in Roman Law:—Lincoln's Inn: Indrajit Kalabhai, Goolam Fazulbhoy Visram. Middle Temple: Milkhi Ram Choudhry, Bakhshi Sain Das Sethy. Gray's Inn: Johndra Nath Bonnerjee, Guru Das Nanda, Jaishi Ram, Sirdir Foujdar Singh.

An open competitive examination for clerkships of the superior grade of the Civil Service will be held in August next, concurrently with the open competitions for the Civil Service of India and for Eastern Cadetships in the Colonial Service.

Sir Courtenay Ilbert, assistant Parliamentary counsel to the Treasury, has prepared a digest of the statute law relating to the government of India, with an historical introduction and illustrative documents, bringing up to date the consolidating draft of 1873. The work will be published at the Clarendon Press.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

President (elected 1897):
Hon. C. SANKARAN NAIR.

General Secretary:
A. O. HUME, C.B., Rothney Castle, Simla; and The Chalet, Upper Norwood, S.E.

Joint General Secretary (in India):
D. E. WACHA, 84, Hornby Row, Bombay.

Standing Counsel:
Bengal, W. C. BONNERJEE;
Bombay, PHEROZSHAH MEHTA;
Madras, RAI BAHADUR ANANDU CHARLU.

BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., *Chairman.*	Dadabhai Naoroji.
W. S. Caine.	Herbert J. Reynolds, C.S.I.
G. B. Clark, M.P.	J. Herbert Roberts, M.P.
A. O. Hume, C.B.	C. E. Schwann, M.P.
J. Seymour Keay.	Robinson Souttar, M.P.
H. S. Khalil.	Alfred Webb.
W. S. B. MacLaren.	W. Martin Wood.

Offices: 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Telegraphic Address: "Incas, London."

Name of Circle.	Jurisdiction.	Name and Address of Secretary or Secretaries.
1. Calcutta	Presidency, Burdwan and Chittagong Divisions (*except* Murshidabad District) Assam & Orissa	J. Ghosal, Esq., Nolin Behari Sircar, Esq., and Raja Binoy Krishna Deb Bahadur; 62 Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta.
2. Dacca	Dacca District	Babu Sarat Chandra Bose, Pleader, Rajar Deory, Dacca.
3. Maimansingh	Maimansingh District	Babu Anath Bandhu Guha, Sec., Maimansingh Association, Maimansingh.
4. Faridpur	Faridpur District	Babu Ambica Churn Mozumdar, Pleader, Faridpur.
5. Barisal	Bakarganj District	Babu Awsini Kumar Dutt, Pleader, Barisal.
6. Rangpur	Rangpur District	Joges Chandra Das Gupta, Pleader, Rangpur.
7. Dinajpur	Dinajpur District	Babu Madhab Chander Chatterjee, Dinajpur.
8. Pabna	Pabna District	Babu Harendra Narain Roy, B.L., Pabna.
9. Bogra	Bogra District	Babu Peary Sunker Das Gupta, L.M.S., Medical Practitioner, Bogra.
10. Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri District	Babu Umagati Roy, Jalpaiguri.
11. Rampur-Beauleah	Rajshahyi District	Dr. Chandra Nath Chowdry, Rampur-Beauleah.
12. Berhampur	Murshidabad District	Babu Boikunt Nath Sen, Berhampur, Dist. Murshidabad.
13. Bhagalpur	Bhagalpur Division (*except* Purneah District)	Babus Siva Sankar Sahai and Surya Prosad, Bhagalpur.
14. Purneah	Purneah District	Babu Jogendra Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Purneah.
15. Chutia-Nagpur	Chutia-Nagpur Division	Rai Jodu Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Hazaribagh.
16. Behar	Patna Division (excluding the Muzaffarpur and Gaya Districts)	Babu Banwari Lal, Patna City.
17. Muzaffarpur	Muzaffarpur District	Babu Shorashi Charan Mitra, Pleader, Muzaffarpur.
18. Gaya	Gaya District	Babus Nand Kishore Lal and Upendra Chandra Mittra, Gaya.
19. N.-W. Provinces	North-Western Provinces	Secretary, Standing Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.
Sub-divisions of the	*N.W.P. for the purpose of distributing* "India."	
Name of Sub-division.	Jurisdiction.	
Gorakhpur	Gorakhpur Division	A. Nundy, Esq., Gorakhpur.
Benares	Benares Division (*except* Mirzapore District)	Pandit Channu Lal, Benares City.
Mirzapur	Mirzapur District	Babu Sri Ram, Mirzapur.
Cawnpur	Cawnpur District	Pandit Perthi Nath, Cawnpur.
Bareilly	Bareilly District	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Bareilly.
Moradabad	Moradabad District	N. C. Bose, Esq., Moradabad.
Saharanpur	Saharanpur District	Babu Anand Swarupa, B.A., LL.B., Vakil, Saharanpur.
Meerut	Meerut District	Babu Prahlad Singh, Meerut.
Aligarh	Aligarh District	Hafiz M. Abdur Rahim, Esq., Aligarh.
Agra	Agra Division	Babu Tulsi Ram Misra, Mursan, Dist. Aligarh.
Allahabad	All places in the N.W.P. not above enumerated	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sec. for the N.-W. P. Circle, Allahabad.
20. Oudh	Oudh	Munshi Ganga Prasad Varma, Office of the *Advocate*, Lucknow.
21. Punjab	The Punjab	Lala Jrishi Ram, Secretary, Congress Committee, Lahore; Babu Chetan Anand, Multan; Bhagat Ram, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Jalandhar City; Lala Murli Dhar, Pleader, Ambala City; Babu Kedar Nath, Pleader, Delhi; and Pandit Perthi Nath, Pleader, Peshawur.
22. Bombay	Bombay Island, Colaba, Thana & Ratnagiri Dists.	D. E. Wacha, Esq, Presidency Association, Bombay.
23. Sind	Sind	Tahilram Khemchand, Esq., Pleader, Karachi; Himatsing G. Advani, Esq., Shikarpur; and Hiranand Khemsing, Esq., Haidarabad.
24. Ahmedabad	Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals Districts. Cutch and Kathiawar, Rajkot	Rao Saheb Kesavalal Motilal and Ratanlal Ranchhoddas, B.A., Pleaders, Ahmedabad.
25. Surat	Surat and Broach Districts, with Baroda	Hardevram Nanabhai Haridas, Esq., and Bhagubai Dayabhai, Esq., Surat.
26. Sholapur	Sholapur District	Vishem R. Lele, Esq., Sholapur.
27. Bijapur	Bijapur District	Krishnaji Raghunath Natu, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Bijapur.
28. Belgaum	Belgaum District	V. A. Natu, Esq., District Assoc., Belgaum.
29. Dharwar	Dharwar District	Sec., Standing Congress Committee, Dharwar, and Raghunath A. Sule, Esq., Hubli.
30. Satara	Satara District	Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esq., High Court Pleader, Satara.
31. Ahmadnagar	Ahmadnagar District	Shankar Gangadhar Ranade, Mohenlal Hiralal and Kashinath Vinayak Bhawe, Pleaders, Ahmadnagar.
32. Poona	Poona, Nasik, & Khandesh Dist. (*except* Bhusawal)	Kashi Nath Govind Natu, Esq., Narayan Bapuji Kanitkar, Esq., and Laxuman Raghunath Gokhale, Esq., Poona.
33. Ichalkaranji	Southern Mahratta Country	Sadashiv Ramchandra Apte, Ichalkaranji, near Kolhapur, S.M. Country.
34. Berar	Berar	R. N. Mudholkar, Esq., and B. H. Karandikar, Esq., Pleaders, High Court, Amraoti.
35. Nagpur	Central Provinces	Kesava Gopal Tamhan, M.A., Morris College, Nagpur.
36. Madras	Madras, Chingleput, N. and S. Arcot, Nellore and Native States	M.r.ry. V. Ryru Nambiar, High Court Vakil, Madras; M.r.ry S. H. Belgrami, Barrister-at-Law, Madras, Secs., Mahajana Sabha.
37. Madura	Madura and Tinnevelli	M.r.ry. G. Srinivasa Row Garu, Pleader, Madura; M.r.ry. K. R. Gurusami Iyer, District Court Pleader, Tinnevelli.
38. Tanjore	Tanjore and Trichinopoli	M.r.ry. S. Ramachandra Iyer Aol, High Court Vakil, Tanjore; M.r.ry. K. Vasudeva Iyengar, Mirasidar, Srirangam; M.r.ry. N. Vydianadha Iyer, M.A., Kumbakonum; M.r.ry. P. Rathna Sabapathy Pillai, Pleader, Negapatam.
39. Bellary	Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, and Karnul	M.r.ry. Srinivasa Row Garu, B.A., Pleader, Bellary; M.r.ry. Dhone Subba Row Garu, Pensioned Deputy Tahsildar, Karnul.; Hon. Rai Bahadur C. Jambulinga Mudaliar, B.A., M.L., Cuddapah; M.r.ry. P. Kesava Pillai, Pleader, Gooty.
40. Malabar	Malabar and Kanara	Hon. C. Sankara Nair, Poonamalli Road, Egmore, Madras; M.r.ry. K. C. Manavikraman Raja, Secretary, Kerala Mahajana Sabha, Calicut; M.r.ry. T. Viraraghava Iyer, Palghat; M.r.ry. T. C. Naraina Kurup, High Court Vakil, Tellicheri; Rao Bahadur N. Shiva Row, Pleader, Mangalore.
41. Salem	Salem	Hon. C. Vijiaraghava Chariar, B.A., Pleader, Salem.
42. Coimbatore	Coimbatore and Nilghiris	M.r.ry. C. M. Padmanabha Chariar, B.A., B.L., Coimbatore.
43. Ganjam	Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavari, and Kristna	M.r.ry. B. Surianarayana Rao Garu, Vizagapatam; M.r.ry. C. Rungachariar, High Court Vakil, Musulipatam; M.r.ry. D. Subramaniem, Pleader, Coconada.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—Intending Subscribers to "India" should communicate with the gentleman whose name appears as Secretary to the Congress Committee for the district in which they reside, or with the London Office. All the gentlemen so named are in monthly correspondence with England, and receive a certain number of spare copies of "India" to enable them to obtain new Subscribers, and are authorised to receive subscriptions to the Journal, which are payable in advance. They will also from time to time transmit to London the names of Subscribers who have paid, so that all such Subscribers may receive their copies direct from England every week. Subscribers are requested in giving notice of any alteration in their address, to quote the number on the covering wrapper of their copies of "India."

TO ADVERTISERS.—Intending Advertisers should apply for terms to any of the following: The Manager, "India," 84, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.; The Secretaries, Calcutta Congress Committee Offices, 11, Clive Street, Calcutta; D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay; The Secretaries, Mahajana Sabha, Madras; Sangam Lal, Esq., Secretary Congress Committee, Lahore; Secretary, Congress Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

In Crown 8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

THOMAS BEST JERVIS,

LIEUT.-COL. BOMBAY ENGINEERS, H.E.I.C.'s SERVICE, DIRECTOR OF THE TOPOGRAPHICAL AND STATISTICAL WAR DEPARTMENT.

A Biography by his Son, W. P. JERVIS.

"The biographer has done his work with judgment and discretion, and has produced a work of considerable general utility and interest." *Glasgow Herald.*

"A faithful autobiography. As being a centenary tribute by his son, there is much relating to the condition of India in former times, the better enabling us to judge of the progress manifested in that country of late years."—*Western Daily Mercury.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, ESQ., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,
SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S NERVINE

Prevents Decay. Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d.

"INDIA." Vol. VIII. (1897.)

NOW READY.

BOUND IN CLOTH (post free), 8/6, *net cash.*

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

A limited number of VOLUMES V. (1894), VI. (1895), *and* VII. (1896) *can be obtained at the same price. Remittances should accompany order.*

English Newspapers, Books, Magazines, &c.

WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS, Ltd.,

WHOLESALE AND EXPORT BOOKSELLERS, STATIONERS, AND NEWSVENDORS,

CANNON HOUSE, BREAM'S BUILDINGS, LONDON, ENGLAND.

(*Established* 1809.)

Orders for ENGLISH BOOKS, MAGAZINES, PERIODICALS, NEWSPAPERS, &c., punctually attended to, carefully packed, and despatched by first mails to Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, India, China, and throughout the world.

Remittance, or reference for payment in London, to accompany all orders. Advertisements and notices of Births, Marriages, and Deaths inserted in all the English Newspapers. Send for a Complete List of English and Foreign Newspapers, Magazines, &c. Also for Catalogue of Works and Text Books in the Oriental Languages.

6d. Weekly.]

THE "HOME NEWS"

Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE.

SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR
INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months...	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year	1 10 4	1 8 2

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & Co.

OFFICES: 55, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

THE STORY OF THE MALAKAND FIELD FORCE.

An Episode of Frontier War.

BY
WINSTON L. SPENCER CHURCHILL,
Lieutenant, the 4th Queen's Own Hussars.

With Maps, Plans, etc.
Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LONGMAN, GREEN & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 1.

THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

(Being a series of Suggestions towards the prevention of Famine in India. Reprinted from "India.")

Obtainable from the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Price Sixpence, or Six Annas, net.

"Louene"

A Simple, Safe, & Reliable NERVE SEDATIVE.

GUARANTEED PURELY VEGETABLE AND NEITHER OPIATE NOR NARCOTIC IN ITS ACTION.

For NEURALGIA, NERVOUS HEADACHE, FACEACHE, SLEEPLESSNESS, and other Nervous Troubles.

The EARL OF MOUNT-CASHELL writes: "Acted like magic, and relieved pain almost immediately."

The COUNTESS OF BANTRY writes: "A good remedy for sleeplessness."

PRICES, 2/9 and 4/6 per bottle. Post free in the United Kingdom, 3/- and 4/9. Foreign postage extra.

Pamphlet, containing many valuable Medical and other Testimonials, post free on application to

THE LOUENE CO., 43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.